GLOBAL NUCLEAR ENERGY PARTNERSHIP

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

The public hearing in the above matter was held on March 13, 2007, at 6:00 p.m., at Red Lion Inn, 2525 North 20th, Pasco, Washington.

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. LAWSON: Good evening. Thank you all very much for coming. Let's get started. We have a number of people who would like to speak. We have a presentation to be made tonight, so let's move it right along.

Let me start by, again, saying good evening and welcome to this public scoping meeting on the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement from the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership.

The development of an environmental impact statement for this project by the Department of Energy's Office of Nuclear Energy is required by the National Environmental Policy Act.

My name is Barry Lawson, and I will serve as the facilitator for this event. My role is to ensure that this meeting runs on schedule, and that everyone has an opportunity to speak. I am not an employee of the Department of Energy, nor am I an advocate for any party or position.

And before we go any further, as you can tell, I would like to announce that we have two sign language interpreters for the deaf and hearing impaired here tonight. Anyone who would like to take advantage of

the service is welcome, certainly, to come up to the front of the room for better interpretation.

At the registration table, you should have or will be receiving a participant's packet. It contains important information on the presentation to be made tonight, and there's a convenient place to take notes during the briefing that will follow in a few minutes.

There are three purposes for tonight's meeting. In the display area back there, there are presentations. We want to provide information to you on the content of the proposed Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement or what is referred to as the PEIS, and on the National Environmental Policy Act, often referred to as NEPA, which governs that process.

Second, of course, is, you've gone through this, if you were here earlier certainly, you had a chance to have any questions that you might have answered on the proposed PEIS and on the National Environmental Policy Act.

The third purpose is to receive and to record your formal comments on the scope of the proposed PEIS.

The agenda for tonight's meeting reflects these purposes. We will begin this portion of the meeting with introductory remarks by video of Mr. Dennis Spurgeon, who is DOE Assistant Secretary for Nuclear

Energy.

That will be followed by a presentation from Mr. Ray Furstenau regarding the proposed Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for GNEP, or the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership.

Mr. Furstenau is the Deputy Manager for Nuclear Energy at the DOE Idaho operations office. To answer your questions during the evening, project staff will be available throughout the time at the display tables at the back of the room. Those people can discuss with you the proposed PEIS and the NEPA process, the contents of the pertinent materials on display, as well as the contents of Mr. Furstenau's presentation.

Following his presentation, we will recess for a very brief time. I'm going to say at the most ten minutes. And I ask for your cooperation on that so that we may get set up for the comment period. I can get my formal list of speakers, and we can get the court reporter ready for that.

So hopefully, if you do have time and you want to ask some questions during that period, you're certainly welcome to do that, but I'm going to keep that period as short as possible.

Once we reconvene, the court reporter will be available to receive your comments and suggestions

regarding the scope of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership proposed PEIS. Only your comments will be transcribed and made part of the permanent record.

So at this point, what I'd like to do is to begin with a video presentation by Mr. Dennis Spurgeon.

(Video presentation was given).

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Spurgeon. I'm now pleased to introduce to you Ray Furstenau, who is the Deputy Manager of Nuclear Energy at the DOE Idaho operations office.

He will express the background of the project and the purpose and basic elements of the proposed PEIS. We will not be taking questions. We want to get through his presentation as speedily and gracefully as possible, because we really do want to get to your comments. And we have a lot of commenters.

I would like to also suggest -- First of all, I want to thank the people who were brought out here to open this wall, that makes a lot of sense. And also you may want to redistribute yourselves so that some of you can get a little closer when we get to our break, which will come probably in about 25 minutes or so. So if you will just hang on, I'd appreciate that. Mr. Furstenau.

(Slide presentation given).

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Furstenau. I certainly appreciate your willingness to make your comments as brief as possible to cover the subjects.

We're now going to take that five minute break that I warned you about before. It's a chance for you to resettle. If you have an overriding question that you'd like to ask, there will be people in the back of the room.

I'm telling you I want to get started as quickly as possible, so if you're not going to change your seat or ask a question, if you want to stretch in your seat, that's fair. Don't wander off too much because I'd really like to get going.

I understand we have nearly five dozen speakers. And so just as a fear of warning, I give gold stars to people who can keep their comments within three minutes. And in any case, I'd like to ask you to keep them no more than five, so that if you're preparing your comments a little bit -- Also a fair warning, and I'll announce this a little more formally later, that if you do not you have comments, written comments, you certainly can leave them with us, and we hope that you will.

And written comments will be considered with the same weight as all comments. So if you only have -- only can summarize your written comments tonight, that's

fine, just make sure we have your full comments because they will all be entered into the formal record.

Okay. We're going to take a few minutes break and we're going to get the list of people to speak and we're going to get the hearing officer up here and get the court reporter ready. We'll break for about five minutes. Thanks.

(Recess was taken).

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. A moderator in a situation like this realizes he's only as good as the people who are in the audience. So I really want to tell you how much I appreciate in advance your helping to make things move along, being respectful and being prepared to make your presentations.

There are a number of people who are trying to convince them to limit it to three minutes. I'd like to do that, but I know if you're going to go over that, I can accept that because there are some people who may be short. But please try to stay on the topic as well so we don't go off on tangents and that we emphasize points that you think are the most important points.

It is now time to receive those formal comments on the scope of the proposed PEIS. This is your opportunity to let the Department of Energy know what you would like to see addressed in the draft document.

The court reporter, of course, is here to transcribe your statement. And our court reporter tonight is Monica Breeden. And Monica is seated over against the wall.

Once again, for those who came in late, my name a Barry Lawson. I am the neutral facilitator this evening. I am not an employee of the Department of Energy, nor am I an advocate of any party position or working for any facility.

Let me review just a few ground rules for formal comments. I would ask you when your name is called to please step up to the microphone over to my right, your left, when your name is called. Introduce yourself, provide an organizational affiliation where appropriate. As I said earlier, if you have a written version of your statement, please provide a copy to the court reporter after you have completed your remarks.

Also please give the reporter any additional attachments to your statement that you wish to have entered into the transcript. Each will be labled and submitted in the formal record.

Now, I will call three names at a time. The first of the speaker who will be speaking, and two others, of the people who will be following, in other words, on deck. And I would ask you if once you hear

your name on one of those three lists, if you would make your way to the front of the room.

I have four or five seats in front of me so that you would be here on deck and ready to step up to the bat when it's your turn, but it also will save a little time for all of us.

In view of the number of people who have indicated an interest in speaking, I'm asking you to try to keep your remarks to three minutes. I have five at the outside. I will let you know when you have a minute left. I'll try to do it as gracefully and as speedily as possible at that point. I would ask you to end your comments as gracefully and as speedily as possible at that point.

Mr. Richard Black will be serving as the hearing officer for the Department of Energy during the formal comment period. He will be seated at the front table.

Mr. Black is the Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary of DOE's office of nuclear energy in Washington. He will be joined by Mr. Furstenau, who you met earlier. Neither will be responding to any questions or comments. And just in case it comes up, if you have a question that you would like to ask for the record, I'm going to consider that a rhetorical question, one that

will be entered into the record, but will not be answered tonight. Hopefully it will be addressed somewhere in the Environmental Impact Statement.

Also it's so important for us, not only because of the hearing impaired, but also for the court reporter, that if you have any conversations that you need to have with a neighbor, if you could please do them outside this room, that would be greatly appreciated. And certainly if you have any pagers or cell phones, if you could disengage them, that would also be appreciated as well.

Okay. I'm ready to go. Is everyone ready? The first three speakers -- the first speaker will be Claude Oliver. And Mr. Oliver will be followed by Ken Dobbin and Bob Parks. Again if Mr. Dobbin and Mr. Parks, if they're not already close up front, if they could move up front, that would be great. Mr. Oliver, you're on.

MR. OLIVER: Good evening. It's a pleasure to be here tonight. At this time, I'd like to personally say thank you to Energy Secretary Samuel Bodman and the entire Department of Energy staff for advancing the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, GNEP. You are taking a bold step for all Americans, and we appreciate it very much.

On June 5, 2002, I coordinated a Hanford 400

Area Facilities Washington D.C., briefing the White House offering these one of a kind nuclear facilities that could be used for national purposes. Our delegation was comprised of Dr. Alan Waltar, head of the Texas A & M Nuclear Science Department, Dr. Thomas Tenforde, then with Pacific Northwest Lab and Dr. Marc Garland, now with the National Lab at Oak Ridge, Tennessee, plus Dan Keuter and Jeff Mahan with Energy Nuclear. I believe you folks at US DOE know Mr. Keuter as one of our leaders for the nation of the US DOE 2010 Public Private Partnership Initiative.

Noteworthy for our White House delegation, Energy Nuclear, Inc., had just been awarded the Thomas Edison Award, June 4, 2002, as the best electric utility in the Unites States. Additionally, the price of oil was at the lofty price of $24 a barrel. Today Texas crude was down $1 to $60.05. That still represents a $36 a barrel increase, up 250 percent. Maybe the moral of the story is no matter how good you are in nuclear, you should always hedge your bet with a little oil.

Well, yes, but now, wait a minute, it gets interesting. We got some numbers today. In 2001 the price of a pound of nuclear fuel was $7 a pound. Today the price of a pound of nuclear fuel is $90, up $5 from just last week. That $83-plus difference represents a

1286 percent price increase. So what is going on?

The Consumption Family of Middle East oil has grown with two significant additions: China and India. It should be noted in the 3-13-07 Tri-City Herald Edition, "GNEP meeting today," that China is rapidly moving ahead with plans to build 30 nuclear reactors by 2010, and that the International Atomic Energy Agency anticipated at least 60 new plants in the next 15 years, 30 of them already under construction. The world is going nuclear, and America ought to as well.

Our highly skilled work force, world class scientists, researchers stand tall. We offer one of a kind facilities that can be ready to advance our national program years faster and billions of dollars cheaper. Please develop timelines and cost comparisons for any and all GNEP facility and site selections for the United States. We can help. And thank you.

And for the record, I'm including a correspondence from Benton County Commissioner, GNEP support letter to Governor Gregoire of August 28th, '06, Benton County Commission Support resolution of August 28, '06, and our friends at the Washington State House of Representatives for FFTF support of 2005 on a passage of 85 to 8. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. And thank

you for setting a good example. Next speaker is Ken Dobbin to be followed by Bob Parks and Sol Guttenberg.

MR. DOBBIN: Good evening, I'm Councilman Ken Dobbin, West Richland. I'm here tonight speaking on behalf of citizens of West Richland and Americans nationwide who desire a national security, a viable energy future, better medicine, cleaner environment and an economically viable future.

The West Richland City Council officially sent a draft resolution to TRIDEC asking them to proclaim community support for the GNEP work here potentially at Hanford. I won't go through the whereases, but the resolution concludes "The location of a major GNEP research center at Hanford is a sound choice. The FFTF and FMEF are essential facilities for this research. These facilities will contribute to the development of clean and safe nuclear fuel cycles. Development of this technology will assure that future generations have a continuing supply of abundant and affordable power long after oil and gas are depleted, and this technology will provide energy safely without harm to the environment."

Now, this proclamation was prompted and follows, and is consistent with the January 7th federal register request for proposals. One of these facilities is an R & D facility. And in this last category, Hanford

has a tremendous competitive advantage, at least $5 billion and a 10 year head start over any other site when you consider the Fast Flux Test Facility and the neighboring hot cell facility close, the Fuels and Materials Examination Facility. The Fast Flux -- The FFTF was designed and operated as a fuel cycle development fast reactor. It has tested oxide, metal and nitrite fuels in a sodium cooled environment. It has closed loop capabilities so it can actually test other fuels along with the sodium coolant. It operated successfully and demonstrates fast reactor safety in both overpower and loss of coolant scenarios.

The FMEF is located next door. It's a nearly complete hot cell facility, and would cost probably in order of a billion dollars to replace. The testing that occurs in FFTF and FMEF is vital to licensing any large scale commercial fast burner reactors. The delay in advanced fuel cycle research for a decade is unacceptable.

The federal register goes on to say -- That's the January 4th, 2007 edition, The United States faces significant energy challenges including increasing energy supplies in ways of protecting and improving the environment. Meeting each of these advantages is critical in expanding the U.S. economy and protecting

energy and national security. Additional R&D is necessary to implement these proposals. The FFTF and FMEF are located on the DOE site. As you heard earlier, that is a requirement.

It's obvious that the Hanford site provides a tremendous advantage. We can continue the Hanford legacy of contributing to our nation's strength. We can utilize highly technical, talented work force and not lose them to other sites. It would be detrimental to our nation's future if there are career realignments. If recycle isn't expeditiously employed, the Yucca Mountain site won't be large enough to boldly accept the commercial spent fuel and the loss from the Hanford vitrification plant. We will not allow that waste to continue to be stored at Hanford just because we don't want to recycle fuel.

I'm a nuclear engineer with 32 years experience working core physics and as a core reload designer. FFTF operated flawlessly for ten years. FFTF demonstrated exceptional safety characteristics that will be vital when you're performing tests with the transuranic Type II assemblies.

FFTF can also simultaneously produce medical isotopes, which are vital in the cure of cancer and other diseases. In the past, opponents have opposed using

these facilities, but I require the Department of Energy to ask them to demonstrate that they understand what they're talking about, to demonstrate they understand what's being proposed, and that they come up with a viable alternative. I haven't heard one yet.

I will not stand back quietly and allow our nation be led by false profits down the road to destruction. I know that Hanford's a preferred location. It's right close to the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory and Washington State University. That would be an excellent combination of facilities for our nation's advancement.

I am asking the Department of Energy tonight to select the Hanford site for the research and development aspects of the GNEP project. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker will be Bob Parks. Mr. Parks will be followed by Sol Guttenberg and Phil McGuinness.

MR. PARKS: Thank you. I'm Bob Parks, Benton City Councilman here speaking for our council. On September 6th, we passed a resolution, it reads:

"The President announced on February 6, 2006, the GNEP, whose purpose is to develop innovative advanced reactors and new methods to recycle spent nuclear fuels

in an environment and demonstration of advanced burner reactors;

"Whereas the Hanford site and outstanding local technical staff offers the Department of Energy an excellent range of options to meet their Siting Study Requirements;

"Whereas the 400 Area, which includes FFTF and FMEF and Energy Northwest site and the corridor between these two have excellent capabilities and infrastructure, which appear to match the DOE requirements for GNEP;

"The use of existing facilities, including FFTF and the 400 Area complex will result in considerable cost savings;

"Advanced Burner Reactors will be the cornerstone for improved nuclear fuel that enhances energy security and that enhances nonproliferation;

"Whereas recycling spent fuel will enable nuclear repository such as Yucca Mountain to handle U.S. fuel for a full century;

"Whereas the Tri-Cities, Washington has the unique facilities and scientists, engineers and labor that are uniquely qualified to fully participate in Generation IV and GNEP advancements;

"Whereas GNEP mission expands the job

creation horizon for thousands of highly skilled workers and advances education and science and in trades;

"Now, therefore be it hereby resolved that the City of Kennewick," blah, blah, blah, "James R. Beaver, Mayor."

On behalf of the Commission, everybody's support, everybody that's here tonight, regardless of whether we agree or disagree, we're going to have a good discussion about this. And thank you all for attending.

MR. LAWSON: I'm glad you said "Blah, blah, blah." Our next speaker is Sol Guttenberg to be followed by Phil McGuinness and Natalie Troyer.

MR. GUTTENBERG: Good evening. My name is Sol Guttenberg and I am retired. I worked at Fast Flux Test Facility for 29 years at various management positions. So when I speak about the FFTF, it's with some understanding of the plant. As everyone knows, it's currently undergoing deactivation. However, the plant is very robust, flexible and forgiving.

Yesterday's newspaper mentioned a five-day workshop with scientists and engineers involved in the startup and operation of the Fast Flux Test Facility.

This group of which I was a member looked at various issues and has confidence that that Fast Flux Test Facility can be successfully restarted at a cost and

schedule that would be attractive to the Department of Energy. Of course, more detailed evaluations and studies followed by independent review would be required.

Once all the necessary activities to support restart are completed, the FFTF can again operate at a level of technical excellence unsurpassed anywhere in the world by a Liquid Metal Reactor.

Functionally, this test reactor can then perform the mission for which it was specifically designed, to test fuel.

In this case, different compositions of fuel with high loadings of actinides which could be critical to the qualification of this fuel for GNEP.

Further, the FFTF was initially reviewed by the NRC to demonstrate its licensability. Coupled with its natural circulation, decay heat removal capability, it is one of the safest reactors in the world.

In conclusion, the Department of Energy has an opportunity to rectify what I consider to be one of its most ill-advised decisions, the shutdown of FFTF. I implore you, don't make the same mistake twice. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Our next speaker will be Phil McGuinness followed by Natalie Troyer and Gerry Pollett.

MR. McGUINNESS: Thank you. I'm not a good public speaker, but I wanted to say three points primarily.

The first is that the worst mistake that we made was not circumvented in 1974 or '75 when Jimmy Carter decided to arbitrarily stop the closed fuel cycle. I'm sure you want DOE to kindly correct that mistake.

They've given France and Britain a great advantage over American companies for developing and selling nuclear power so Japan won't buy a reactor from Westinghouse or GE, when the French can offer to buy and give them a credit and pick up their fuel for them. This is what we can do with this country, give our American companies competitive advantages again.

The second point I wanted to make to the DOE for public comment is that I have, from my own personal opinions, do not believe the test site for all facilities for GNEP to be located at the same facility at the same location.

But that leads me to the third point. I am tremendously biased having worked at FFTF for 33 years, but FFTF is the most advanced test reactor that we had at least to the time it was shut down.

There's nothing that comes close, nothing else that has the neutron energy spectrum, nothing else

has the facilities for making testing fuels materials. No other reactor in the world has set a record for getting more kilowatts per pound of fuel or metric tons, I believe. Some of the nuclear physicists can correct me if I'm wrong.

I don't believe that DOE has any facility that has a hot cell as big or as advanced as our examination maintenance cell.

So I hope that DOE corrects the mistakes that were made by Jimmy Carter and his administration to arbitrarily, without additional public input, shutdown the closed fuel cycle and open the reactor again, so we can compete with other countries in the world and improve our nuclear industry and our energy infrastructure. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Natalie Troyer. She will be followed by Gerry Pollet and Gary Peterson.

MS. TROYER: Good evening. Hello. My name is Natalie Troyer, and I'm a publications and volunteer coordinator for Further Demands of Northwest in Seattle. I talk to members on a regular basis, and I'm constantly hearing from them this overwhelming sense of discouragement. This new plan to bring more waste to Hanford.

Just last week, I spoke with one Walla Walla resident who said "We've been coming to these meetings for 15 years, and we've still been hearing the same messages about waste import. I get the feeling that we're just not being listened to."

Now, here we are again, decades behind cleanup schedule and $8 billion over budget filling a vitrification plant to treat the existing waste. Over one million gallons of liquid high-level nuclear waste has been contained at Hanford. And now it's estimated at the existing rate, as a secret proposal unavailable to the public eye, we get to bring in the rest of the nation's spent nuclear fuel to Hanford. It's also a haphazard when we put our waste as Hanford's problems. Reprocessing is what? Cleaning up 53 millions gallons of waste at Hanford, cleaning up leaky tanks.

So I ask you if more liquid high-level nuclear waste is added to Hanford's problems, how long will it take to classify all of Hanford's tank waste as a classic examination on tank waste?

And secondly, what are the risks to communities and the public if a truck carrying spent nuclear fuel crashes, or some other accident occurs? To me, this wishes hands to hold. Hanford needs to be cleaned up and in compliance with state and federal code

before more waste is added to the problem. We've been saying that for years.

Initiative 297, the Hanford Cleanup Initiative passed with 70 percent of votes. 70 percent of voters statewide, if you're asked for, anything remaining at Hanford be cleaned up before more waste is added. The voters have spoken, but I get the feeling that we're just not being listened to. Thank you for your time.

MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Gerry Pollett followed by Gary Peterson and Sid Morrison.

MR. POLLETT: Thank you. I'm Gerry Pollett, Heart of America Northwest. Welcome, Alice, through the looking glass and to the DOE and Hanford wonderland. We've been invited to comment here tonight on the scope of an impact from TRIDEC's proposal to site GNEP facilities at Hanford. But only in wonderland the Department of Energy or the governing agency refused to make public that proposal for you to look at and find out how much waste is proposed to be imported to Hanford, where will it be stored for decades, trust me our decades delayed from building a reprocessing plant, how much waste will be reprocessed and where will that liquid high-level waste be stored, and where will the other waste be disposed of?

Our GNEP TRIDEC's proposal addressed what would happen with the waste. Doesn't the public have a right to see that? Not in DOE wonderland. We've been invited to a hearing, the honor of government in sunshine, sunshine in government week, and this is how the Department of Energy operates in that spirit. TRIDEC proposed to use our transparent facilities for its proposal, and the Department of Energy called the proposal proprietary and refused to disclose it. That works in wonderland.

The Department of Energy paid TRIDEC $1 million to study and report on and solicit, quote, list of opinions, summarizing state and local stakeholders' concerns, issues, and boundaries, but TRIDEC is the proposer of the facility. TRIDEC, like the opposition to the initiative that said "clean up before you add more waste," so you can certainly trust them to honestly report for $1 million of our tax money.

Reprocessing is what created 53 million gallons of liquid high-level waste sitting in tanks at Hanford. Only in wonderland do we call this recycling. It needs chemical processing to extract the plutonium transuranics and uranium. Heat craves liquid high-level nuclear waste. But let's use our terrific experience to date in building a vitrification plant that's only -- oh,

it's not operating, excuse me. It's only $12 billion over budget. It will operate starting in 2019, and it is designed for 50 percent of the capacity of the waste in the tanks. So let's see what TRIDEC proposes to do with the liquid waste that would be produced from reprocessing. Aren't we entitled to see that?

The Department of Energy said we will reduce the quantities of waste, but naturally, it's only the waste going to the hypothetical repositories after increasing and reducing. More waste will remain at Hanford under this proposal.

First off, the spent fuel will come in, maybe half the nation's spent fuel, maybe all of it, fuel from all over the world, before there is a reprocessing facility. Deputy Secretary of Energy was quoted as saying recently, "Let's be real about temporary storage. Let's all be real about decades."

So let's just take the waste and think back, are we really ever going to reprocess it? Then what will happen? What will happen if we do reprocess it? The plan is based on reducing the amount of cesium and strontium going to the repository. All of Hanford's radioactivity is sitting in a swimming pool with cesium and strontium capsules that are supposed to go to the repository. And yet, we're going to add more cesium and

strontium extract it from reprocessing, and in DOE's words, "use shallow land burial at the processing facility." We can't bury the radioactive waste from Hanford's existing tanks without heating ground water values already. We know that. We can't deal with the waste that is at Hanford already without having contamination in the groundwater and the Columbia River that exceeds our expectations for cleanup for thousands of years. That exceeds the minimum successful standards for cancer risk to the next generation that will use the Hanford reach national market. So let's bury more cesium and strontium out at Hanford, not just cesium 137 mind you, but also the long-lived cesium 135 that will result. The waste will come in -- Is this a sucker day, folks? Do you really think that the Department of Energy is going to spend an estimated $200 billion on reprocessing? That's probably conservative, given the estimate with the Hanford vitrification plant.

Finally, let me just say the walls are crumbling at Seattle. Why aren't you holding the hearings in Spokane, Portland and Seattle where the waste will all fit? Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Gary Petersen followed by Sid Morrison and Pam Larsen.

MR. PETERSEN: Good evening. And thank you to the Department of Energy for having us here tonight to hold their scoping meeting.

I want to start by saying too, that I wish I had as much emotion as the young lady who doing signing up here during Gary's presentation.

I also want to preface my remarks with two points, one is that the TRIDEC proposal and the Columbia Basin Consulting Group proposal are both on the website available for any public to look at when you get on there.

I also preface my remarks by saying that for the record, that TRIDEC has consistently said Hanford cleanup comes first on both the Tri-Cities and the TRIDEC community agenda. TRIDEC also felt it has an obligation to the community to look for new industries and even new Hanford missions that can take advantage of existing DOE facilities and our highly educated and trained work force. And we feel very strongly that the GNEP mission can actually reduce nuclear waste and help Hanford cleanup.

The core elements of GNEP address critical and growing energy and environmental needs of this country, while also ensuring a strong U.S. leadership role within the international community on energy production issues

and policies. This is an innovative strategy, and I encourage DOE to diligently pursue the course you have outlined in this plan.

TRIDEC is here today to put forth the Hanford Site as a leading candidate for locating GNEP facilities, to include a Nuclear Fuel Recycling Center and an Advanced Recycling Reactor. We hope that Washington State, all of Washington State, will enter into this conversation about energy self-reliance, global warming, and nuclear waste reduction.

This community and our State can bring technical, scientific and educational expertise to the establishment of these facilities, and we will leverage a labor work force that is already skilled in safe nuclear plant and nuclear power operations.

I want to say thank you to Dave Molnaa, Dave Smith, Mike Tibare and all of the qualified technical work force that exists here in the Tri-Cities.

The existing infrastructure present at the Hanford Site offers enormous cost and logistics benefits to the government for new energy production and fuel recycling activities. This infrastructure spans highly unique existing buildings built but not tapped for missions, such as the Fuels and Materials Examination Facility (FMEF) and the Maintenance and Storage Facility

(MASF), and the Fast Flux Test Facility, which is our nation's only sodium-cooled fast reactor. This site also encompasses an NRC licensed and operating power reactor, as well as roads, railroad lines, utilities, even a storage treatment plant and other infrastructure designed for large-scale nuclear operations intended for the Hanford Site.

The local community has familiarity with respect for nuclear activities and depth in science and research development that will support all aspects of a national energy strategy including an expanded role for nuclear power.

TRIDEC urges your continued evaluation of Hanford as a candidate GNEP host site while proceeding with your assessment on implementation of the GNEP program. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: This will be Mr. Morrison and then Pam Larsen and John Darrington.

MR. MORRISON: I'm glad we're all together this evening, and this is a wonderful subject for us to discuss at this time in the history of NRC, Hanford, Tri-Cities area, and the nation and the world.

I'm no stranger at all to Hanford. I won't share a lot of the things I've done in the first 24 years as an elected official from this area. Twelve years

spent on science and technology in Congress, including a number of years, 12 years, on the Energy subcommittee, so I've visited a lot of facilities around the United States. I also throw in, because transportation is important in this, and eight years as the Secretary of Transportation. Let's just say that I am passionate about the capabilities at Hanford and the operators this site have to offer in the way of new technologies can be applied to meeting increasing concerns about global energy and waste reduction. I have to express my frustration that all my adult life has been held back by our unwillingness to apply modern technology to our nuclear fuels program, and now we have something in front of us that has great potential.

In retirement one of my jobs is to serve as Chairman of the Executive Board of Energy Northwest, so I'm going to concentrate my comments on some of the values, the capabilities, the potentials that are there, but I think it gives us a significant leg up over a lot of other sites you will be visiting in this scoping process.

We have the Columbia Nuclear Generating Station, and we manage a broad mix of carbon-free energy production facilities, wind power, hydro, solar, bio-mass, the list goes on. We're very, very proud of

it, and proud of the people that work for us here in this community.

The Energy Northwest site, which is adjacent to the 400 Area, which has already been described, alone offers the Department of Energy a level of infrastructure and certain features that are unparalleled by any of the other locations being considered. Our land is leased from Department of Energy. The sites are licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

In addition to the license for operating the Columbia Generating Station, the NRC issued construction permits for the unfinished WNP-1 and 4 plants. This is a fact that greatly reduces licensing uncertainty and can contribute to meeting DOE's project development schedule for this GNEP facility.

The sites also are adjacent to the Bonneville Power Administration's Ashe Substation. This is important, multiple high-voltage lines available, and by the way, they run both ways. They bring energy in during the construction time, and they have access to much of the northwest and southwest for distribution of power when it is generated, and redundant power supplies available in that setting.

Putting on my transportation hat, I'm amazed at the quality of railroads that were built here, for the

best production purposes, the highways, the arterials, side roads are in place. They can handle everything related to construction as well as the operation of these facilities.

MR. LAWSON: One minute please.

MR. MORRISON: Also delighted to have barge access on the Columbia River only five miles from the site that's being proposed. So there's a lot of flexibility already in place; for instance, cooling towers designed to handle more than 5000 megawatts of energy, lots of water available and a pump station on the River, emergency cooling spray ponds, that sort of thing are in place.

We already have nuclear waste, 520 metric tons there right next to the site that we're talking about. We're also delighted to have AREVA be located in the Tri-Cities, one of the world's leading organizations, corporations on recycling and dealing with fuel.

Next to the 400 Area, the FFTF, the Fuels Examination Materials Facility, a whole host of things that are there, fundamentally unused and they play a major role in this process.

Put this all together, the people in this room, the people in these communities and the experience of all the people at Hanford and the assets that I've

tried to describe here that are part of Energy Northwest, as well as the Department of Energy come together in time to be one of the answers for this concept of GNEP can overcome my long-standing frustration as a nation we have failed to do what we know we could do in the handling of nuclear energy and its fuels.

So I say this is the place, and we're ready to be a player. Include us in your scope. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Pam Larsen to be followed by John Darrington and Alan Waltar.

MS. LARSEN: Good evening. My name is Pam Larsen, and I am Executive Director of the Hanford Communities. The Hanford Communities is an intergovernmental organization comprised of six of the local government jurisdictions that surround the Hanford site.

The organization was formed to provide unified advice and to support to the Department of Energy on environmental cleanup and economic transition issues. Our efforts focus primarily on issues associated with the cleanup of the Hanford Site.

This evening I would like to focus on the future of Hanford beyond the cleanup mission. There is increasing awareness in this nation of the worldwide consequences of global warming and the need to generate

energy in a way that does not produce the greenhouse gasses of fossil fuels. We are also becoming painfully aware of the need to reduce our dependence on foreign nations for our energy supply.

France is many years ahead of us in coming to these realizations. I have had the opportunity to tour the nuclear fuel reprocessing facilities in England and France. After touring the facility in Lahoug, I was given this representative canister. They informed me that the black cylinder inside represents the vitrified waste left over after producing nuclear power for a family of four for 20 years.

Another strong memory of my tour was the environmental monitoring information available to the public regarding the operation of the fuel recycling and vitrification facilities. All of the data generated from monitoring is available immediately on the internet.

We also took the time while in France to meet with farmers, elected officials, business owners and others to ask if they had any concerns from an environmental or risk standpoint about living near a nuclear fuel reprocessing plant and a waste vitrification facility. Not one of them had a single concern to raise to us.

I would like to discuss how future missions

can support the top priority of our organization, the Hanford cleanup.

While we have been successful in putting 2100 metric tons of spent nuclear fuel in dry storage, we have no place to send it. The possibility of Yucca Mountain opening is increasingly remote. In this region we also have spent nuclear fuel from the Columbia Generating Station and 33 canisters of spent fuel at the Trojan site in Oregon.

Although we often hear concerns from Oregon about transporting nuclear material, I think the state might be happy to have some place to send the Trojan fuel.

On the topic of shipping, nuclear materials have been shipped to and from the Hanford site for years. Due to the precautions taken and the robust design of shipping containers, emergency responders in this region believe there is far more risk to the community from gasoline tankers that come and go on a daily basis.

In regard to work force needs for cleanup and the GNEP, I believe that ongoing nuclear missions at Hanford would benefit the cleanup. The Hanford work force is aging and retiring. It is hard to recruit uniquely trained individuals to come here, because when the cleanup is done, they will no longer have jobs to

support their families. The development of new missions gives these younger engineers and craft people a reason to move to our region. It also will ensure that it is worthwhile for our college and university to develop academic programs to train individuals for this field and to support advanced degree programs.

MR. LAWSON: One minute please.

MS. LARSEN: End states and industrial controls after cleanup: Through open public processes, Hanford has dev.
Eloped a plan for the end state of the central plateau when cleanup is done. That end state is an industrial use.

It is believed that by having an ongoing industrial use on the land, the memory and records of waste that will remain at Hanford will be perpetuated. This will ensure that institutional controls will be effective in protecting human health and the environment from risks that will be associated with buried waste. What better future use than a new mission for the Department of Energy.

We urge the Department of Energy to take a serious look at the facilities, infrastructure and skilled work force that we offer to programs that will be part of the GNEP. Thank you for holding this hearing in

our community.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is John Darrington followed by Alan Waltar and Bob Schenter.

MR. DARRINGTON: Hello. I am John Darrington. I am the Chairman of the Hanford Communities Administration Committee and also Richland City Manager. And Sid Morrison, who has spoken, has presented the basic statement on behalf of Hanford Communities.

I would just like to say that we support TRIDEC's GNEP Hanford Study proposal. I would like to centralize on three things that I think are important to recognize. There are key advantages that TRIDEC's proposed Hanford site has.

First, there's an established infrastructure at this location. The Hanford Site features existing facilities, utilities and transportation capabilities that meet or exceed GNEP requirements. There are more than 300 continuous acres of land that are laboratories, office buildings required from the system mission objectives. There is linkage as has been stated to the Bonneville Power Administration Tri-Cities grid. And there is access to highway, rail, and barge transportation.

Next, there is an experienced work force for

funding, skilled nuclear work force from qualified nuclear operators to doctoral level nuclear recyclists and engineers.

Finally, this is a nuclear funding environment here in the Tri-Cities. Residents understand the requirements associated with DOE's and U.S. Nuclear Regulatory mandates for nuclear facilities and understand the vigorous safety and quality assurance programs that are in place. Thank you for having this hearing.

MR. LAWSON: Before Mr. Waltar speaks, and then after Bob Schenter will be the following speaker to be followed by Marlene Oliver.

MR. WALTAR: My name is Alan Waltar. I am retired as Director of Nuclear Energy at PNNL, retired Department Head of the Department of Nuclear Engineering at Texas A&M University and past President of the American Nuclear Society. Go Aggies.

I first wish to congratulate the DOE visionaries who conceived the GNEP vision. It is absolutely the right thing at this time for our nation and for the international community as well. I had the pleasure of chairing a session at the World Nuclear University Summer Institute in Stockholm last summer when Dr. Victor Reis shared the GNEP vision with some 90 Fellows from about three dozen nations, those Fellows

being highly selected as very likely becoming the nuclear leaders of their nations in the coming decades. Though skeptical on nearly every idea presented to them over the 6-week Institute, there was wide-spread acceptance of the GNEP concept. I felt this most encouraging.

However, I believe there is one significant deficiency in the program as I now understand it, and that is the lack of emphasis regarding the need for testing the fuels that will be needed to make GNEP a success. It is crucial that we understand the behavior of high transuranic-bearing fuels in fast spectrum reactors, because it is the destruction of such transuranics that forms the very heart of the entire GNEP concept.

Simply put, there is not a regulatory agency in the world that would allow the startup of a faster reactor employing driver fuel with high concentrations of transuranics or even with high loadings of high transuranic-bearing test assemblies, given the current data base for such fuels.

Without adequate fuels qualification and performance testing, premature fuel failure could impose an unacceptably high environmental risk to the entire GNEP program.

So the question is where will this testing be

done? Having no operating capability of our own at this time, the United States has no choice but to locate foreign facilities for such testing. In the end, I suspect the only potentially viable choice is Russia, utilizing the BOR-60 in Dimitrigrad. But there are two fundamental problems with this situation. First, major international agreements would need to be consummated to allow such testing. I think this is possible to achieve, but very time consuming; and second, BOR-60 is a rather small, very old facility, incapable of testing fuel consistent with the dimensions necessary for commercial interest. Further, no in-house capability exists for examining the test assemblies discharged from the reactor.

But now the good news. The right facility for performing such testing; namely, the Fast Flux Test Facility, already owned by the DOE is right in our own back yard and a highly competent group of seasoned FFTF builders and operators of this facility have just concluded a preliminary study that leads us to believe that it is technically feasible to restart this machine within an attractive schedule and budgetary window. The results will be made public in a few weeks. This is exciting news.

This revelation may come as a surprise to a

great many people, including many in our own community. After all, this facility was shut down over a decade ago and substantial efforts have been made since that time to take several of its crucial systems out of service, including a modification of the core basket to enable draining of residual sodium. But I am convinced that this facility, universally acclaimed to be the queen ship of fast reactor research with testing capabilities unmatched anywhere else in the world can be brought back up to power.

As such, I ask the question: Is FFTF restart being considered for inclusion in the GNEP PEIS? If not, why not?

I respectfully offer two primary recommendations to this panel: 1) Authorize and fund a highly respected, independent engineering firm with technical knowledge of liquid metal-cooled reactors to perform an in-depth analysis of what it would take to restart FFTF within an acceptable regulatory envelope; and 2) immediately halt any activities that could further erode the condition of FFTF activities that could prevent the possibility of including an FFTF restart as a feasible option in the GNEP PEIS. As you know, a contradiction exists when the same agency takes action to review an option while at the same time taking action to

prevent it. Thank you for your kind attention.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. We're doing very well. Our next speaker is Bob Schenter, followed by Marlene Oliver and Jerry Straalsund.

MR. SCHENTER: My name is Bob Schenter. I've been a nuclear scientist for 42 years. I'm a Fellow in the American Nuclear Society, and the past year of the Eastern Washington section. And I'm here to strongly support the restart of the Fast Flux Test Facility.

During those 42 years, I've worked on many projects with FFTF. I'd like to mention two projects that I worked on as an examples of how that reactor can do multiple missions simultaneously.

One was the production of gadolinium-153, which is used for osteoporosis detection. There's a world shortage of this isotope research. In the middle '80s some of the FFTF produced gadolinium-153. It went to the Walla Walla Clinic. We worked on that.

Simultaneously, very important, for the work on thousands of hours of the engineers and the scientists that FFTF have out at Hanford to produce high quality plutonium-238 for the space program.

A very important point, DOE, the gray matter in those scientists' heads is more important than the facility or anything else, and will be a major

contribution to the GNEP program, that gray matter.

Also very important aspect, and Claude Oliver asked me to mention this, is the community support. Back in February of 2002, a very good report was written and put in the record Roy C. coordinated the various organizations in the community, the Washington State University Radiopharmaceutical Program, Tri-City Cancer Center, the Pacific Northwest National Lab. This is just a few of the organizations in the Tri-Cities to support, and back in 2002 they were behind FFTF medical isotope programs.

Finally, I'd like to make two comments, one for the audience. I don't have -- I hope you can see this -- or I'll show you, never give up. For DOE, DOE, we're ready. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Next speaker is Marlene Oliver to be followed by Jerry Straalsund and Gerald Woodcock.

MS. OLIVER: I hope you can hear back there. I have a cold today. I'll do my best, but I wanted to echo what the previous speakers have set forth, Ms. Troyer, Mr. Pollett. I think that they could use an education from the scientific minds in this room to upgrade their knowledge, and hopefully, the people in this room need to take some of this knowledge to the

people on the west side. Because when Proposition 297 passed overwhelmingly, it was defeated overwhelmingly in this community because we know what we're talking about.

I would urge the Department of Energy to please follow the Federal Data Quality Act. It requires that decisions be made based on sound science. You've heard some of it here. If you want more, you can probably hear more until the cows come home.

I would urge the Department of Energy to follow the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. I'm here, both as an environmentalist and as a patient advocate. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 requires that the Department of Energy make available to the United States research and industrial isotopes and medical isotopes. You talk about destroying the cesium and strontium in those tanks. We would like you to reverse that decision and make those products available to produce isotopes to cure disease.

I would like to put a little bit of international perspective on what we're talking about. I may be a little prejudiced. My husband also happens to be a nuclear scientist, and I travel around the world with him. He goes to meetings, and I visit medical centers around the world. At those meetings, we went to one in Japan. Last year I traveled to one in Russia entitled "Research Reactors of the 21st Century." There

were close to 300 scientists there. International Atomic Energy Agency, you have a letter on file. They have requested FFTF restart. You have a letter from the Ukraine. You have a letter from France. France has 80 percent of its power coming from nuclear. The French aren't concerned about it. They hope to get to 90 percent. The values are increasing. The first Parliament passed a law. They're now building another nuclear reactor. The United States needs to get with it. These scientists have asked that we please restart FFTF.

I see this, not as a local project, but as a United States project and as a worldwide project. There will be scientists coming from national labs here, from all around the world.

On Friday, I got a call from the DOE officials, "Government officials are not allowed to lobby."

I said "Okay. I'll lobby for you." They know me. What we came up with and I hope DOE listens to this, is that there are brilliant minds in all of these national labs and all of these facilities around the world. And I would ask the Department of Energy to see what can be computed from each so that each country that wants to participated in the U.S. has that opportunity so that everybody wins.

Oh, yeah, I used to do cost benefit analyses when it came to the medical community. And just from a taxpayer's standpoint, the cost benefit of restarting FFTF in terms of the bottom line dollars for taxpayers and in terms of time, we do not have the luxury of time. The people in this country want to see their nuclear waste decrease, not only reduced, but they want to see it go away. And we have the opportunity to help that happen in a big way. So let's give Heart of America what they want. Let's restart this facility and reduce the problem of nuclear waste in this country and in the world, and also address the nonproliferation issues that affect all of us today. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Next speaker is Jerry Straalsund followed by Gerald Woodcock and Judith Cosby.

MR. STRAALSUND: Hi. I'm Jerry Straalsund. Time. Wow. I've been here for 40 years. The first 20 of those years, I had the wonderful experience of participating in a dynamic DOE-wide program to advance fast reactors, fast reactor technology, to help qualify people for Columbia River reactors. Both are really wonderful periods of time.

I've been retired now, but the other thing about time is, I just heard a statement that relates to time and national leadership. There's a period of time

when our country needs to be able to show such leadership in order for peace, if no other reason.

This statement on time, it comes in a presentation earlier today, the United States must act decisively and quickly to implement GNEP or face the real possibility of having no influence over certain future global expansion of nuclear energy. The facilities here at Hanford offer the opportunities for saving time.

Time and the implementation of leadership and the development of technology, which is desperately needed by the world. I would hope to see time be a major criteria in the selection of facilities for the participation in both the GNEP programs. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Gerald Woodcock followed by Judith Cosby and Carl Holder.

MR. WOODCOCK: Good evening. My name is Gerry Woodcock. I'm representing Eastern Washington Section of the American Nuclear Society. Eastern Washington Section represents over 125 of the area's most prominent scientists, engineers and administrators in the nuclear field. This constituency is eminently qualified to assess and evaluate the government's Global Nuclear Energy Partnership.

GNEP's three-pronged approach for an advanced fuels testing facility and fuel treatment center and an

Advanced Burner Reactor makes perfect scientific, engineering, economic and moral sense in today's world.

It also makes perfect sense to use the existing facilities to the greatest extent possible in the implementation of the GNEP goals. The United States should proceed with a GNEP program as quickly and as economically as possible.

Quickly, because the goals of GNEP are real and present. Huge segments of the world's population are without power. These people live in apallingly primitive conditions in abject poverty. The availability of electricity would be a tremendous step forward in lifting these people out of their horrific conditions and setting them on a pattern of decent living conditions and some semblance of economic and personal security.

Quickly, because the terrorist threat is now. To counter it, we must act now. Terrorists don't debate. They don't negotiate. They don't equivocate. They act. Any and all measures we can take to counter these threats must be taken and taken with dispatch.

Inexpensively, because we're talking about our tax dollars. Every penny the government spends comes ultimately from us, you and me. Good stewardship of public finances is what we're all about.

From these perspectives, it is clear that

using pre-existing facilities, which you and I have already paid for, which are technically well-suited to the GNEP goals will both shorten the lead time necessary to implement GNEP and keep the cost for doing so at an absolute minimum.

Our specific recommendations for the PEIS are these: First, carefully consider the impact of not implementing GNEP. What will be the impact on the world environment if nuclear energy is not more widely available? What will be the impact on the United States if the volume of high-level spent nuclear fuel cannot be reduced and many more Yucca Mountain-sized storage facilities will be needed to hold it all? What will be the impact on our own economic well-being if our country is relegated to the sidelines in a global nuclear renaissance that's already occurring?

Second, consider the difference in overall environmental and economic impact between using the existing Hanford facilities for the appropriate aspects of the GNEP program, and having to construct purpose-built facilities elsewhere from scratch beginning with a brown field.

Recognize that Hanford can walk and chew gum at the same time. We can continue our cleanup efforts while easily readying for its assigned role in GNEP. In

fact, the two efforts complement each other. The Washington State Department of Ecology and the people of this nation see this as an enhancement to this site's cleanup activities.

We owe it to our children, to all those less fortunate than us, and to all taxpayers to implement the GNEP program as expeditiously and as cost-effectively as possible. If we really are concerned about the welfare of people in our state, our country, and in the rest of the world, the moral imperative is clear. And that imperative is implement GNEP at Hanford. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Our next speaker will be Judith Cosby followed by Carl Holder and Linda Alexander.

MS. COSBY: Can I have you interpret what I'm saying too? Because the people here have been watching everybody else's words. Thank you.

My name is Judith Cosby. I'm from Walla Walla, Washington. I've spent more than 50 years of my life within 60 miles of Hanford. I cannot believe it's an impossible a task to convince the United States of America that it is an unwise proposal to ship 63,000 metric tons of nuclear waste and will remain radioactive for 10,000 years across thousands of miles of American highways and rails, across mountains, dodging drunken

drivers, rock slides and snow storms for the purpose of planting this high-level radioactive waste virtually alongside one of the largest rivers of the world and next door to the only active volcanoes in the continuous United States.

Please listen to me. Over a million gallons of high-level radioactive waste have already leaked out of storage bins at the Hanford reservation. The nuclear industry and the federal government want us to believe that high-level radioactive waste are safe for humans, perhaps thousands of years. We've been unable to contain them for even 50 years. We are told the best expertise in the nation is at work at the facility at Hanford. I'd like to point people toward two crucial issues.

The first is accountability. The second is the human right to environmental health and safety. Accountability, who is it that is providing the technical information on site selection? Who is it that is providing statistical information on safety, someone who has the continuation of nuclear power on defense as an economic incentive? The TRIDEC Industrial Development Council? Fluor? Bechtel? CH2M Hill? The Washington Group? All of the reassurances of these corporations in the nuclear industry and federal representatives about the relative safety of nuclear power must be weighed on

the scales of best product and guarantees that no industrial corporation or power company involved in nuclear technologies is financially responsible for damages.

What do Fluor's assets come to? Bechtel's assets? Or Washington Group's? CH2M Hill? Are all the utilities and private companies sincere about the claims as to the safety of nuclear power and these technologies agree to put their money where their mouth is? Not mine. Let the nuclear industry put their assets on the line and insure each other. If this technology is as safe as they've been telling us for 50 years, this should pose no problem.

At bottom, the problem is that for all the expert reassurances over the years, that nuclear catastrophe is always a real possibility. All the actors have a severe accident potential. Should we multiply the terrible fact ten-fold by shoveling radioactivity all over the county? Mothers Against Drunk Drivers think they've got problems now. Just wait. No. Don't wait. Just say "No."

May 18, 1980, Mount St. Helens erupted ending 123 years of inactivity. And mud flow disrupted ship traffic 30 miles downstream in the Columbia River. Aren't people glad that there weren't any barges of

radioactive waste on that river? What would we have been told if there were?

My home is 60 miles from Hanford. We raised here to Washington State that feeds America and the world. Thousands of acres of fertile land are irrigated with Columbia River water. Many thousands more acres of agricultural land share the winds that blow across Hanford.

The United States in the nuclear age is operating on the theory that a really big earthquake won't happen near any of the 100 sites of the nuclear power plants. Even more precariously, we are gambling that there will be no nuclear power plants all along any of the transportation routes all over America.

MR. LAWSON: One more minute please.

MS. COSBY: If anybody's got a billion dollars to spend, I suggest they invest it in cleanup, actually containment. Cleanup is a misnomer, one of those lies I've been told. I suggest that they accomplish the task that's already set for themselves before spending another damn dollar on nuclear power or nuclear weapons.

This is not my first hearing. In the last 25 years, I've been lied to by some of the best names in the business. I've been lied to about bids. I've been lied

to about timelines. I've been lied to about budgets. I've been lied to about environmental protection. I've been lied to about cleanup for years. Cleanup itself is a misnomer. We can't even contain the waste that we have already generated.

Now you ask me to trust these corporations and my federal government, while they're absolved from all liability remember, to be the caretakers of some of mother earth's most toxic poisons, right here in my homeland, not only for the next several generations, but for the next 10,000 to 20,000 years.

Admit that you cannot keep up with the time schedule or the cost of treating, cleaning, temporary storage, more permanent, but still temporary storage of the waste that we already have.

Every time that someone's talking about a permanent disposal site, two of those words are wrong. Permanent disposal is not yet possible as far as any country on the face of the earth goes. They're talking about permanent site, not permanent disposal.

I implore you to hold more public hearings in the pacific northwest, public hearings in Seattle, Portland, Spokane. I beg my governor not to abandon the 2004 overwhelmingly mandate for Washington State voters to cleanup existing high-level radioactive toxins before

they import more from inferrals much less worldwide.

Prove to us, brilliant scientists, that you can clean up what's already here first. Offer yourselves as a demonstration to the world. Show us that vitrification works first, before selling us the song and dance of reprocessing. It is reprocessing, not recycling. Recycling sounds rather harmless. It's like the U.S. Nuclear changed their name to U.S. Ecology. Oh, boy. That certainly made me feel better. Now, I'm relaxed, everything's in good hands.

MR. LAWSON: Ms. Cosby, I'm going to have to ask you to kindly finish.

MS. COSBY: Please contain the toxic poisons that are corroding and contaminating our soil. Restore pristine Columbia River. Restore dams before creating any more waste or importing any more of these toxic poisons from anywhere. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker will be Carl Holder and Linda Alexander and Ralph Johnson. The court reporter has asked if we can take a few minutes for her to get a breather.

I would urge you not to go too far. Whenever there's a break like this, some people tend to leave. I hope you don't, but If you do, let me just tell you I appreciate your coming and participating this evening. I

know it's a long night and if you do choose to leave, thank you for very much for coming. We will take a four minute break at this point.

(Recess taken).

MR. LAWSON: I just wanted to thank you. I know it's difficult in locations where there are people expressing their opinions on maybe two, maybe three or four sides of a particular issue. By and large, show some respect for people's points of view wherever they may come from. I very much appreciate that and I'm sure everybody else does too. I think we're about ready to start.

Our next speaker once again will be Carl Holder. Mr. Holder will be followed by Linda Alexander and Ralph Johnson.

MR. HOLDER: Thank you very much. It's a pleasure to be here this evening, to be able to participate in a National Environmental Policy Act of 1969's public comment.

Also it's very interesting that the National Environmental Policy Act has served this nation extremely well, largely because it involves the public in the decision making process of our federal government.

Also the National Environmental Policy Act requires that the federal government recycle, and for the

fission use of all of its scarce resources, in this case would include nuclear fuel.

The Department of Energy has -- There's over a hundred nuclear reactors in the United States, and it provides over 20 percent of the power.

Last week, we had had an interesting event happen in the nuclear power business, where there was a new facility site license issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which signals the rebirth of nuclear energy in America.

And also the President's advanced nuclear energy initiative for the GNEP program will address the requirements and how to have nuclear leadership throughout the world, but the nuclear infrastructure has deteriorated terribly, and this affects our potential leadership and leadership credibility within the office of nuclear energy.

The Department of Energy can gain almost instant credibility with the utilization of unique capabilities found in the 400 Area. And FFTF can be the most powerful tool in the world for higher actinite fuel testing.

More importantly, the FFTF represents the United States core cadre of experienced fast reactor personnel. By maintaining this critical continuity of

experience in new generation of the scientists, engineers, regulators, and operational staff came from around the nation and around the world will benefit from this operational facility of sodium systems.

I also belong to an organization called the Environmentalists for Nuclear Energy, and we asked them to make a resolution in support of GNEP.

On December 9th, 2006, a joint session of the annual meeting of the members of the Environmentalists for Nuclear Energy and the Board of EFN International made a resolution in support of GNEP and FFTF as an important component of the program.

The GNEP initiative intends to demonstrate and deploy to the United States and around the world environment friendly technologies to recycle nuclear fuel, minimize nuclear waste and reduce the risk of nuclear proliferation.

Achieving these important objectives will serve to protect the environment and provide for a better, cleaner, safer and more ecological future. Fast neutrons are essential in testing new nuclear fuel cycles and for the development of reactors in the program of Generation IV and the FFTF is a unique installation in these regards because of Hanford's many years of experience in nuclear energy research and operating the

FFTF, the Hanford site is perfectly suited for development and continuation of research in GNEP program with FFTF as one of the major facilities.

With its fast neutron flux, the FFTF is also a unique instrument in the United States for production of radioisotopes used for medical diagnosis and treatment saving thousands of lives every year.

EFN considers the location of a major GNEP research facility at Hanford as a sound choice and underlines that the FFTF is an essential facility for this research and will contribute to the development of clean and safe nuclear fuel cycles and development of Generation IV reactors to make sure that future generations have a continuing supply of abundant, affordable power, long after oil and gas are depleted. So as to assure the continuation of our civilization for millennium safety and without harm to the environment. Bruce Colby, President of EFN International. Thank very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Our next speaker is Linda Alexander followed by Ralph Johnson and Dennis Fitzgerald.

MS. ALEXANDER: Today we are on the threshold of global opportunity. The options place a new super freeway in the history, thereby changing Hanford's

legacy of creating super powerful weapons of mass destruction into a leadership example of true environmental responsibility by turning a nuclear waste debacle into a non-emission energy recycling process that is the best environmental solution on our planet.

In turning straw into gold by recycling partially spent highly radioactive -- reactive byproducts and converting them into power and healing radioisotopes, this will expend and drastically reduce radioactivity and the need to prohibitively costly long-term storage in remote areas as the Yucca Mountain repository. The Fast Flux Test Facility is the ideal instrument for demonstrating this recycling technology. It is built excelling in every test, and it's precisely the facility needed for us progressing into the future. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Ralph Johnson and then Dennis Fitzgerald and Gordon Sturrock.

MR. JOHNSON: Good evening. My name is Ralph Johnson. I'm an independent consultant specialist in integration of complex systems and also somewhat of a specialist in program management for very large programs. And folks, what I see is, turn up the volume.

And what is the right tune for turning up the volume? The great step to energy independence and the

new road for managing radioactive waste, and we have the potential for cancer and HIV solutions through medical isotopes, and we can regain world leadership that's been sitting in the back corner for 30 years.

So that's the tune. Atoms for Peace is back. Many of you remember President Eisenhower when he started animals for peace. It kind of got put on the shelf. Well, it's back here now, 50, 60 years later.

So the nuclear age is here. And what's so tough about that? The world has already made the decision, so who are we to dispute the decision made by the world?

Nuclear is the number one alternative to alternative energy. It was only the budget committee in Congress who was worried about who gets the subsidy payments that nuclear got put on the back shelf rather than being one of the alternative energies.

So I encourage everybody to stress that alternative energy nuclear is number one. And so what are the byproducts that you get if we move ahead with GNEP? We get an adequate energy Supply. We have less dependence on oil. We have reduced global warming, and we have the potential medical isotope cures.

And Dr. Bob there has briefed me in the past. Not only do we have maybe 10 or 12 that are in use, he

says there's a potential for 400 or more of them that we don't know anything about at all as to what they are and what they'll do in the health field or other fields.

So that's where we are. We're here. And we're here through GNEP. There's no other route that I know that will get us to any of those improves. And so what do we do about it? We have to develop an infrastructure because that has faded away with time.

We need an infrastructure here in the northwest, in the State of Washington, and we also need a national infrastructure. That's one thing we do.

Second thing we can do, provide support to the American Council and Global Nuclear Competitiveness. Now, you've probably never heard of them, but I feel very strongly that nuclear energy is the top of our President's priority list, and he recruited his number one trouble maker to move in and do something with nuclear energy, which is GNEP.

So provide support to them. Provide support to TRIDEC in their proposal. Provide support to Columbia Basin Consulting Group, which is a programmatic technical support arm.

And then above all, and I'll say a little bit more about support the State of Washington and its program for progress.

And above all, do not forget DOE and their endeavor, which is to regain nuclear leadership within the realm of the world.

MR. LAWSON: One minute please.

MR. JOHNSON: So I'll move very quickly in the security. Personally, I have been trained in effects of nuclear weapons. One air burst over Seattle, and everybody's toast.

And so keep that in mind, you, your family, your grandkids, so averting any potential to nuclear warfare has to be at the top of the list. And this program is at the top of the list for the world to do so. So please support. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Dennis Fitzgerald and then Gordon Sturrock and Alexandra Amonette.

MR. FITZGERALD: Good evening. My name is Dennis Fitzgerald, and I'm a cancer survivor. I'd like to talk to you about fear factors, cancer and nuclear energy. There are two common denominators in the fear of cancer and nuclear energy, ignorance and misinformation. However, cancer patients make a concerted effort to overcome their fear by seeking out facts and credible information, including more than one medical opinion. There's also a plethora of helpful

information available on the internet and from other cancer survivors and caregivers too.

Those that fear nuclear energy are not so fortunate. Our government, which has tight control over all of our nuclear energy resources has done an abominable job of educating our citizens on the values and technical aspects of nuclear energy.

As a result, as open doors from the anti-nuclear energy crowd effectively engaging in fear mongery. The debacle side of the Department of Energy's, DOE's bureaucratic sham of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement process. Even though the DOE deliberately avoided taking issue before the biggest stockholders, then and now, on the fate of the FFTF, the cancer fighting communities, the public responded 2 to 1 to restart the FFTF.

Regardless of the factors in pubic opinion, former Secretary of Energy, now Governor of New Mexico, and perhaps a democratic Presidential candidate, Bill Richardson issued a record decision in the last week of the Clinton Administration to destroy the FFTF. At the time the FFTF was the finest nuclear reactor in the western hemisphere, if not the world for producing medical isotopes so desperately needed to fight cancer and other disease. The FFTF was also the DOE's safest

nuclear reactor.

Thus, was born the Clinton Administration's legacy of early deaths for ten of thousands of prolonged suffering and hundreds of thousands more cancer patients each year due to lost production capabilities of FFTF.

Time and again, medical isotopes have proven in many cases to offer kinder and gentler treatment in the conventional/surgery burn external radiation and poisoned chemotherapy cancer treatment modalities.

For example, as debilitating as the chemo was for my wife's breast cancer, her greatest pain and discomfort came from the 2nd and 3rd degree burns from six weeks of external radiation. Now we have a medical isotope treatment internally, takes a week and does not have that burn capability.

When I was recovering from colon cancer surgery, two patients in my room passed through, they had prostate surgery. They went home with a catheter in their bladder for maybe a week or two of recovery.

I met two gentleman tonight that had breaking therapy, probably took them overnight home free and a great cost savings and less pain and suffering.

Here are the impacts that we citizens have to live with as the result of the Department of Energy's complete disregard of the plight of cancer patients and

their families.

Since former DOE Secretary, Bill Richardson issued his infamous ROD FFTF six years ago, out of the this is fight from the American Cancer Society. There have been over eight million new cases of cancer nationally 6 years, and a 160,000 in the State of Washington. We've lost over 3.3 million of our valued citizens to cancer at a continued rate of over 1500 citizens a day.

In Washington the death toll was 67,180, or a little more than the population of Franklin County, 64,200 or the City of Kennewick, 61,700. Nationally, we were expected 1.2 million cases of breast cancer and 2241 deaths -- thousand deaths. 23,602 cases were in Washington, as were the 4470 deaths from breast cancer in six years.

MR. LAWSON: One minute please.

MR. FITZGERALD: In six years the overall cost of cancer for the National Cancer Institution estimate reached over 1.1 billion, direct medical costs reached 403 million, indirect morbidity costs 97 million and indirect mortality costs 621 million. In six years, the cost of cancer increased 31.7 percent.

It's time that DOE starts supporting our

cancer patients. No more deaths, folks.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Gordon Stock to be followed by Alexandra Amonette and Louisa Hamacheck.

MR. STROCK: Hi. My name is Gordon Strock. I'm a member of Veteran's for Peace. I'm from Eugene. I'm one of the people who rode over on the bus.

I just want to say that my views are fairly common among Veterans for Peace. I speak for a lot of them, not all of them, but a lot of them.

I support the goals to reduce toxicity of nuclear waste. I support the use of nuclear materials for medicinal use. And I support the goal to help augment our use of energy by finding some sort of substitute. But I do not support what is happening here or what is being proposed here tonight, and I'll tell you why. There's two reasons.

Number one, like many folks from Veterans for Peace, we do not trust the current administration for the Department of Energy, and there's a good reason for that. How can we how say our goal is to reduce the toxicity of nuclear waste, while at the same time, we shoot tons of the stuff over in Iraq to another continent?

The first Gulf War, we shot 350 tons of depleted uranium -- real quickly if you don't know what

depleted uranium is, most of you probably do, but some don't probably. It's a low-level nuclear waste. It's -- If you had some in your hand, it wouldn't hurt you, but once the depleted uranium has been used on the battle field, it's first initial use, where it is used to penetrate heavy armor, concrete, re-enforced targets.

The depleted uranium disintegrates into billions of pieces, many of those pieces are down to one micron in size. Once those particles become easily air born, they're water soluble, they get in the food chain, and those particles can get in your lungs, of anybody.

In fact, of the Gulf War vets, my brothers who served in the first Gulf War, only one-third of them are disabled because of injuries that aren't apparent, they weren't inflicted by guns or explosions. They were some sort of chemical toxicity -- excuse me, tentacle or nuclear toxicity and has affected nearly one-third of them.

Now, in the fist Gulf War, we shot 350 tons. In the second Gulf War, we shot over 2000 tons of depleted uranium. Now, that uranium is over there. It's going to be over there. It has a half life of four and half billion years. It's not going away. We have to live with it, so many of us feel we are committing genocide. This is a grave war crime, and there's no

excuse for it. And the reason I'm telling you this is because, how could we do this to another people?

Many of us belief that this program that's being proposed is nothing but an elaborate bait-and-switch program for the real reason, which is to start manufacturing of the recently announced next generation of nuclear weapons.

The second reason is because we feel -- There are many of us that feel a sustainable lifestyle is what we need. Nuclear energy had been proposed to help that happen, but we don't believe it's good solution.

We think we need to look at the other end of the equation. We need to preclude our dependency on energy. We need to figure out ways to become extremely energy efficient. We can do that by many of the things that have already been suggested. I heard geothermal, hydro power, solar power, wind, human energy, alternative fuels, like the bio-diesel fuel that got us here from Eugene. What we need to do is, we need a rapid and extreme move towards energy efficiency, clean energy, not nuclear power. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. And our next speaker is Alexandra Amonette. She will be followed by Louisa Hamacheck and Jack Dresser.

MS. AMONETTE: Thank you. I second the

last speaker's remarks. There are alternatives such as wind power, improvements in energy efficiency, advanced solar cells, advanced hydro power, some types of sustainable bio-mass, and geothermal. And at four to six seconds per kilowatt hour, wind power at favorable sites in the United States is already competitive with natural gas and nuclear power.

I'm from Richland, Washington. I primarily oppose the GNEP because of the largest vulnerability associated with the expansion of nuclear power and its connection to the potential proliferation of nuclear weapons. There's no scheme that any of us have been able to design that assure us that people won't mind the waste for plutonium to make bombs and the waste containers won't deteriorate and contaminate water that people tens of thousands of years from now would use for drinking or irrigation.

I also fear a terrorist attack, like the planes that crashed into the World Trade Center or nuke plant. One of the books I'd like to share with you at the end has estimated that the number of reactors required simply to maintain the electricity sectors' CO2 emissions at their 2000 levels would be 2500 -- 2500 gigawatt -- I'm sorry, 2500 gigawatt nuclear power would be necessary by mid century. And that means that one

plant would needs to come online every six days between years 2010 and 2050.

In order to fuel 2500 reactors, the world's uranium in Richland capacity would need to be increased by six times. Just 1 percent of that capacity could supply enough high-level enriched uranium to create 500 nuclear weapons every year. And if the plutonium and spent fuel discharge from that number of reactors each year was separated, it would be enough make more than 60,000 nuclear bombs. That's twice the number in the world's nuclear arsenals today.

So in addition, you know, catastrophic accidents can and do happen such as at Chernobyl. In addition, the waste repository is a huge problem already as is the case with Yucca Mountain. Yucca Mountain shouldn't come online anyway because it's on Indian land, and they don't want it. And for that reason alone, I oppose it, but you'd need enough repositories to come online to the tune of 75,000 metric tons every five years to handle the waste that will be generated by the next -- by this proposal.

Cesium-135 and Iodine-129 are very long-lived, and the state's long-term management has so far eluded us, eluded our science and technology.

And finally, the proportion of our

electricity supply and nuclear power plants would increase only slightly from about 16 percent to 20 percent by this proposal.

So I think it's time to move on from considering this proposal, which I feel very fraught with and danger, and begin focusing on developing more rapid and robust and sustainable options to address the global climate change and increase demands for electricity.

And there's two books I'd like to encourage folks who like to read, one is called "Insurmountable Risks, The Dangers of Using Nuclear Power to Combat Global Climate Change." And the other is a book that I co-authored a chapter in called "Nuclear Wasteland." And both of them are available on the website: www.ieer.org. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Next speaker is Louisa Hamacheck. And she will be followed by Jack Dresser and David Smith.

MS. HAMACHECK: Hi. I'm Louisa Hamacheck. I'm with Eugenian For a Safe Columbia River, and I'm speaking as a mother and a resident of the watershed of Columbia River. I'm a watershed steward, and I work as hard as I can for our stretch around the river to take care of our river branch of the Columbia.

And I discovered only about a month ago that

our electricity 7 percent of it comes from your town, from the Columbia Generating Station. And so now I have a connection to your town and to the Columbia River all way up here. And I am not positive or sure in any way that nuclear power is going to be operated or generated in a safe manner.

I understand that the DOE has not met any of the cleanup deadlines, and there's plumes of very toxic chemicals that are radioactive that are reaching the Columbia River now. The fish are radioactive. The Sturgeon should not be eaten. This is what I'm hearing from the fish people. I don't know if any of you feel like it's fine to eat the Sturgeon, but I've been hearing that it can cause cancer and birth defects. I see a lot of you smiling out there.

(Disruption from audience).

MR. LAWSON: Okay. Excuse me, please. We have one speaker at the time.

MS. HAMACHECK: I also feel that an investment in the nuclear power here is a partnered with the 26 plans to develop new nuclear bombs. I am morally embarrassed that our northwest has participated in the bombing of the Nagasaki and the terrible deaths that atomic bombs bring about to this world. And it is an immoral embarrassment of the entire population of the

United States. And I don't want to be at war in this way when our environment of the entire glove is at a critical point, where we need to work together. I do not want to point nuclear bombs to threaten with out power at other countries.

I want to work together on an energy program and food program and clean water program. We have very simple needs as animals. We don't need to be greedy and power mong in trying to push other people around. It does seem to be that we are fighting in Iraq for oil.

So I strongly promote renewable energy and the wind program and perhaps if we can make the Columbia River safe for the fish with the dams, there must be a way that the hydro electric can work.

So I speak for the animals that are unable to speak tonight. I am an animal, and every one of you are. And you're affected by the radiation that is emitted from this town. And you have a responsibility to the entire world. If you think that the volume of water will flush away the problems from this area and flush it down the Columbia River, because we have such a mighty river, and it is magnificent and it is mighty. And at this point, it seems to be flushing away, but it's flushing out all the radiation that you are creating, out to the sea. And that is going to the whales and to the fish. And the sea

is not a disappearing place. The sea is experiencing toxic overload and that radiation is going around the entire world, and its's your fault.

You've allowed this to happen here and it's your responsibility, of your county commissioners and the State of Washington that has allowed the Department of Energy to allow this pollution into the river that I'm jointly responsible for.

As a mother and as an animal, I ask you to prevent any further development of nuclear industries on the Columbia River. And as a user of electricity, I would hope that Eugene Water and Electric Board will stop buying power from Bonneville Power Administration if they cannot stop buying it from your Columbia Generating Stations, which potentially could ruin the Columbia River. That's all I have to say.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Jack Dresser. Mr. Dresser will be followed by David Smith and Bob Bromm.

MR. DRESSER: I'm Jack Dresser. I was an Army psychologist during the Vietnam War. I'm one of the founding members of Veterans for Peace in Eugene. I also am very, very concerned with the use of depleted uranium by my country and my name with my tax dollars to destroy populations for generations to come and the

country of Iraq.

Gordon didn't mention that the depleted uranium represents about 99 percent of uranium that goes through a nuclear reactor. It's left over after the refined U-235 is extracted. And so one of the ways that the DOE has discarded this and gotten rid of this is to simply give it to weapons manufacturers, because it's super hard. It will penetrate steel. It will penetrate tanks. It penetrates concrete. It's a great weapon. The Marine mongers, the Army mongers believe it. You can look on the military website. They're in love with it.

2200 tons have been downed from the country of Iraq. 350 tons were used in World War I. Those 350 tons, if you talk to the doctors about the hospital, in 1987, before we assaulted Iraq, the first time around, they were -- the cancer deaths were recorded in the '30s, you know, 34, 35, 36 a year. Ten years later, which is six years after we dumped all this DU on Iraq, their cancer deaths were up in the 400s. Also the birth defects have just proliferated enormously in Iraq during this period. And Iraqi parents no longer ask "Is it a boy or girl?" They ask, "Is it normal?"

And I have many pictures of this on our bus out there. It's too dark to see them right now. This is genocidal without any question. This is like our agent

orange in the Vietnam War.

A good friend of mind died last year of esophageal cancer secondary to agent orange exposure. Depleted uranium is the agent orange of this generation. And it's the gift that keeps on giving for generation after generation after generation. It's breathed in. It penetrates every organ of the body including the semen. It changes DNA, and transforms every generation to come down the line. That is genocide. Those are war crimes and crimes against humanity, plain and simple.

Anyone producing nuclear fuel is playing a role in that crime. There is no question that we, of course, need alternative energy. We've got to get off of fossil fuels. It's interesting in the GNEP document here, it states "Nuclear power is the only currently available technology capable of delivering large amount of power." Well, of course, because other technologies hadn't been developed.

As many of you may know, the Governors of Oregon, Washington, California and Arizona recently entered into an agreement to develop other alternative energies, including, obviously, in eastern Oregon and eastern Washington an incredible potential for solar and wind power.

In fact, the largest solar farm in the world

is now under construction in eastern Oregon. We have the great title of energy resources. The Oregon coast has been identified as the most promising coast line in the country for title energy.

We're sitting on a volcanic membrane for geothermal energy. Let's take all this money, billions of dollars charged for nuclear research and put them into this kind of research instead, as well as cleaning up this place.

The other thing I noted here was, there's a partnership mentioned with the IAEA, and there's also the statement that this is the largest, greatest source of energy that doesn't pollute the air. There's no mention, of course, the ground and the water in the GNEP documents. It also states that it was nearly impossible and it's, you know, proliferation is nearly impossible that it is proliferation resistant, not proliferation proof.

And the last time I looked IAEA was still unable to provide real-time monitoring of the nuclear facilities all over the Soviet Union that are still very much under monitored. So there's absolutely no faith that I have, or us veterans have, in this whole process that's proposed. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, our next speaker

is David Smith, and he will be followed Bob Bromm and then Laurel Piippo.

MR. SMITH: Good evening. I am David Smith. I am President of the Central Washington Building and Construction Trades Council. The proposed location that we're talking about this evening extends from the western edge of the current 400 Area complex, east to the Energy Northwest site to the Columbia River. The 400 Area site was extensively characterized when FFTF was sited and constructed, as well as the eastern portion of the site that houses Energy Northwest Columbia Generating Station.

Some key advantages to the TRIDEC proposed Hanford site location include accomplished infrastructure. The Hanford site features existing facilities, utilities and transportation capabilities that meet or exceed GNEP requirements.

More than 3000 continuous acres of land, laboratories and office buildings required to assist with mission objectives. Linkage to Bonneville Power Administration transmission grid, access to highway, rail, and barge transportation. We have an experienced work force, a very highly trained and skilled nuclear work force, from construction workers to qualified nuclear operators to doctoral-level nuclear scientists

and engineers. And we have a nuclear friendly environment.

Tri-Cities residents understand the requirements associated with DOE and U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission mandates for nuclear facilities, which includes rigorous safety and quality assurance programs.

If selected for the GNEP program which involves the construction and operation of two nuclear facilities and a research center, this area could expect to see a capital investment of $16 billion and the creation of 8,000 permanent jobs.

In addition, the Burner Reactor would produce approximately 800 megawatts of power to the Northwest. So we have construction jobs, permanent jobs, generating green power, producing medical isotopes, while recycling and reducing nuclear waste. What a deal. And it's a deal our community, our country, and our world needs. And it's one that we need at Hanford, where we can utilize the existing invests that the tax payers have already made in our country, and at the same time meet the needs of the GNEP. I say let's take the deal. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Bob Bromm. Is Mr. Bromm here? He is not. Then our next

speaker will be Laurel Piippo and she will be followed by Gene Kinsey and Nancy Cohen.

MS. PIIPPO: My name is Laurel Piippo. When my husband and I moved here the 1951 to Richland, there were two of us. Now there are 13 of us. I'm the only one who got cancer. And I'm here as a cancer survivor, and I'm going to speak to the medical treatment of cancer.

Between 1989 and 1993, I had breast cancer twice on the right side. And I had lung cancer, and I also had that cancer you get on the end of your nose where your nose rots off if you don't do something. However, that wasn't killer cancer, so it doesn't really count.

I started going to hearings in 1997 in Hood River. And my traditional cancer treatment was the six months of chemotherapy, which is like going to hell without having to die to get there, and also 35 radiation treatments, which causes your skin to burn, blister and bleed, plus multiple surgeries. And some of the side effects that they don't tell you about or you'd say "Thanks, I'll just start digging my grave instead." I have a permanent condition on my right arm as a result of all these traditional cancer treatments. And I also went to Ottowa, Canada for three consecutive inoculations to

prevent a recurrence of the lung cancer, which doctors here don't know anything about. This was in 1991. People ask me "Did they work?" Well, I'm not speaking to you from the grave. So I am grateful for those traditional treatments.

But when I joined Claude Oliver and his group on the cancer train that went down the coast through California, and do you know Maureen Oliver, and hearing her reports on cancer treatment in Europe, I realized that we really are a literally backward country in our treatment of cancer and some other diseases.

When I went to my first hearing in Hood River, I went to a shop and said "I want a bright red T-shirt." And on the front, I want to stay "Stop/burn poison." And on the other side "Start FFTF medical isotopes."

I'm here to speak, to plead with the Department of Energy, as I have been pleading since 1997, we've been begging you to come here and restart FFTF. There is no question about our community support. And I'm lucky enough to receive e-mails, a dozen or more, very well qualified scientists.

I am a retired English and Humanities teacher and don't know beans about science, but I would put my trust in qualified scientists before I would in a smart

lawyer who is a government public relations man, and the Heartless of America with their playing on fear and ignorance.

On the cancer train, we visited several internationally recognized physicians who treat cancer the best they can. Their major problem was not having enough medical isotopes for research and treatment. And doctors don't prescribe medical isotopes or learn about them in medical school because not enough of them are available. You can't prescribe what you don't know about and what you don't have.

So it's the researchers and physicians in California, the ones who are using medical isotopes in Europe. Marlene comes back and tells us about shoes accolades and people treated with medical isotopes. Did I mention prostate cancer treated with medical isotopes. And it amazes me that people blather on about getting nuclear power with hot air and sunshine, and what's the other one -- oh, corn husks. And that really isn't going to work.

I certainly am grateful to still be alive, but I loathe the traditional cancer treatments, and I bet if I ask you to raise your hand if no one has ever known anybody who had cancer, well, you've all had an acquaintance with it. We want better treatment. I want

us not to have to buy medical isotopes from Russia and from Canada. I would like it to be produced here.

And you talk about financial savings of using medical isotopes versus the slash burn poison. We all know the cost of health care is out of site. And it would be to our advantage. Furthermore, we're already paid and paid and paid for that reactor sitting out there. We've paid and paid and paid for the idiocy of trying to shut it down. Now, for heaven sakes, put it to good medical use for the health of the people of America. I've lived here since --

MR. LAWSON: One minute please.

MS. PIIPPO: One minute? That's impossible. I'm wishing far a watch that will stop time. And how much -- speaking of time, how much longer do I have to wait? I wondered, after all these cancers, why am I still alive? What's my purpose in life? Well, then these hearings started. I guess the hearings in Hood River -- By the way, there's more cancer per capita in Hood River than there is in Benton County. I've been to hearings in White Sand, in Portland, some in Richland, in Seattle. I flipped out in Richland, and I said "The United States government and the Heartless of America don't give a rat's ass if we all die of cancer." But I was reprimanded for saying that, so I thought I better

just whisper it.

Furthermore, I'm very proud that the scientists created a means to end World War II. I'll never forget opening the Washington Post on August 8th, 1945 and reading that the war with Japan was over. It saved thousands of lives of American soldiers, and I am proud of what the scientists have did -- have done. Goodness, have did, the idea.

I'm 79 and a half. How much longer do I have to wait for the Department of Energy and the public of America to wake up to the use of nuclear medicine?

MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Gene Kinsey and Nancy Cohen and David Molnaa.

MR. KINSEY: I've never spoken to a group this large before, so this is new for me. I'm a retired Hanford worker, among other things. And what I'm going to tell you tonight is pretty much from my heart, because I didn't make a very good list of notes. I just have a brief thing here.

But in three more days, I'll be 69 years old. I've worked at the major part of almost all of the facilities out in the Hanford work area, including FFTF. I actually played a part in doing some of the wells that make FFTF a very good facility, probably the best in the world. And I'm proud of that.

I also worked for another company called Westinghouse, and I know that one of the things that they had on their wall in one of the restaurant areas was, our people, which is their employees, are our most important asset.

And what I'd like to say to our DOE people here today is that the people of Benton-Franklin and Yakima Counties are a very definite asset. And to ignore that would be very, very bad news in my book. I would say that the people that we have in this community are some of the very finest engineers in the world. And I feel that our work force that we have here is the best qualified and most talented.

I have a dream, not unlike Martin Luther King. I have dreamed that it's possible to build a facility similar to FFTF that is a high temperature reactor that can separate water into its two components, hydrogen and oxygen.

The hydrogen has the potential of fueling our entire national train system. The oxygen has the potential of making every fish in the river a very good place. DOE and the Department of Fish and Game -- Fish and Wildlife need to communicate with each other and see if this has a real option. I would like to see something in that regard.

As a tax payer and a voter, I would like to say very respectfully about my Commander in Chief, Mr. Bush, please put my tax dollars where your mouth is, and let's build some nuclear facilities. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Nancy Cohen, then David Molnaa and Kris Johnson.

MS. COHEN: Hello. My name is Nancy Cohen. I'm glad to see everybody here. Thank you for being here everyone. What can I say to you? I can say that, you know, all of us are here on the planet at this time for a reason. We're here at the time of great change, a time to reconnect the heart.

I know the truth about the nuclear industry and every aspect of it. Sorry, I'm not convinced that it's any good. I don't believe in what it does, but what it does -- what -- It doesn't do -- It doesn't support our purposes for being on the planet at this time. Do you really want to hurt other people, no matter if they look like you or they don't? Not me. Does it matter what other people feel, and what they think, and if they care, and if they don't? And that they're here and if they're well, if they're not well, if they're hurting, if they feel good? Do we care about that? Should we care about that? I think we should care about that. I care

about each of you. I don't know your names or where you live or anything, but do I have to? No.

We have a lot more in common than we don't, and that goes for everyone around the world. We are one world community. And all the boundaries, the state boundaries, the county boundaries, all the boundaries are arbitrary. That doesn't -- That's not about disrespect. I do not disrespect the boundaries of those.

I'm just saying that in truth we are one planet. We live on the same planet, and I hope that we all care about this planet. I know I do. And I believe that in your heart of hearts, you do too.

So my hope is that all of us, the DOE, isn't any different from the rest of us. We're all one living on this plant, and I hope that we will rethink what we have done in the past and what we want to do in the future, hopefully something different, something that causes forth with courage.

It takes a lot of courage to say no to something that's harmful, that's been really popular or where the money's been pushed through for lots of money, trillions of dollars for something that really isn't a good idea. It takes a lot of courage to say no to that, to say yes to something else, because we care enough.

We can do it. I know we can. I'm one

person. I'm one of the six and a half billion people. That's a lot of people. We couldn't even fit all six and a half billion in this room. It's a lot of people. And if each of us does our part, no matter how small, we have the numbers behind us to make a difference. Okay?

Everybody follow what you're here to do, through your heart center. Why are we here in the world? You know, it's not hard to remember why we're here. It's not that difficult. Okay? You know, if the reason I'm here in the world is to be here tonight and to tell you this, good. Because it feels good to talk from the heart center, you know.

I have a mind and thoughts and, you know, I can think but it's more important that I can feel, to have a connection, the heart connection. Okay? So I hope that, you know, we'll all think from this point forward as to why we're on the planet, and what we really want to do and put it into action.

Again, thank you for being here everybody. And DOE, I hope you'll do what's right from your heart's center. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is David Molnaa to be followed by Kris Johnson and Warren Zesiger. I would just tell you we're slipping a little bit on our average.

We were doing pretty well at first, and we're slipping a little bit, so I'll ask you to be as diligent as you can to be on time with your comments. Thank you.

MR. MOLNAA: Thank you. My name is Dave Molnaa. I'm the president of the Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council or HAMTAC, better known as. Our council represents approximately 3,000 maintenance operation and laboratory workers out at the Hanford site.

I had a few things written down here, but my eye sight seems to match my hair color, and I can't read them. Please bear with me. I'm going to have to wing this.

Earlier this evening, we saw a slide that was presented by DOE on to requirements that DOE's going to need to make GNEP a success. And I noticed some of things on the slide, when they talked about facilities, land usage, infrastructure, power, water, sewer, transportation. Well, guess what DOE? We already have it here at Hanford. The investment's already been made. Billions of dollars have been spent of tax payer money. You already have that stuff here. And I think it's time that the Department of Energy starts utilizing the resources a little bit better. It's already bought and paid for, use it.

There's a couple of things that I did notice

specifically on that slide, and one of them was the safety performance of a chosen site. Right now, Hanford currently and proudly displays 13 DOE VPP star flags, and we're pretty proud of that. Given the fact that there's only 27 in the DOE complex, and Hanford owns half of those, I think that, in and of itself, speaks for our safety record out here.

And that type of safety record just doesn't accomplish overnight. That's accomplished by partnerships with developed labor, the contractors in the Department of Energy and protecting the work force out there. And the Department of Energy is going to need those type of partnerships to make GNEP a success out here, or whether they choose.

Another thing, and I think the most important thing that I didn't see specifically mentioned on that was the work force that's going to be needed when this thing becomes operational. The work force that we have out at Hanford, the scientists, the engineers, the operations folks, the crafts and the laboratory workers, I'll put their knowledge, their experiencing, their training up against anybody in this industry, and we'll come out on top.

And that's another call, to utilize the resources, to have you spend billions of dollars on this

work force, and they're ready to go. We're ready to do that work, and we can perform this work. And we can do it safer than anybody else in this complex.

I'll try to cut this as short as I can. The GNEP at Hanford, we fully support the GNEP coming in here, as far as HAMTAC's position is. I think that this is a benefit for the work force. It provides job opportunities, further job opportunities as Hanford gets cleaned up and those jobs go away.

This provides a financial security for themselves and their families and their future, here in the Richland area. That also flows down into the Tri-Cities region as far as providing economic stability for this region, and in turn that flows into an improved economy for the State of Washington.

GNEP at Hanford is a benefit for the U.S. Department of Energy. I encourage you to utilize the resources that you already have right here at Hanford. And GNEP at Hanford is a benefit to the American tax payers and this great nation. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Kris Johnson followed by Warren Zesiger and Robert Gillette.

MR. JOHNSON: Good evening. For the record, my name is Kris Johnson with the Tri-City Regional Chamber. It's a privilege and honor to stand

before you tonight to express our support for the GNEP project led vocally by TRIDEC.

As you know, this is a community that has enjoyed a six-decade relationship with the Department of Energy, working on many of the toughest and most challenging issues our country has ever faced. And in the meantime, we have built this wonderful and diverse community we call home today.

Hanford has an impressive complement of available facility that you heard about today, the highly trained and experienced personnel to effectively implement all aspects of the GNEP demonstration project.

And issue 297 has come up tonight. I think it's important to share that, Judge McDonald, the federal judge, has issued that 297 violates a number of issues, including the supremacy clause and the Atomic Energy Act.

The GNEP mission expands the job creation horizon for thousands of highly skilled and educated workers in our community. This mission here is out of our organization, where business growth and work force development are among the key strategic focuses.

Our local community has supported DOE activities for more than 60 years. And we believe this proven partnership can continue through the GNEP program.

Clearly the Hanford site is an ideal location

for meeting the goals and objectives outlined for GNEP. With the economic impact of tens of millions of dollars, it brought a way of community support, significant infrastructure already in place, and a highly skilled and educated work force.

This proposal clearly offers a win-win solution for DOE and our community. Our community stands ready to serve again. Thank you for being here tonight and holding this hearing here in Tri-Cities.

MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Warren Zesiger and then Robert Gillette and Robert Beach.

MR. ZESIGER: My name is Warren Zesiger. And I'm the former president of the Benton County Farm Bureau. We, the board of Benton County, support the restart of FFTF. We were able to take this from our board, to go to the state with it and put it in their policy book. The policy book is also reading a lot of the restart of the FFTF. We also took it to the American Federation Board, and American Federation Board of Farm Bureau. And it was also put in their policy.

As a farmer, we are not exempt from cancer. And if we go into cancer treatments, like this one gal's talking about, we don't go back to work for maybe a month, two months. We can't afford it. Not only that, medical isotopes this FFTF would produce would create

more jobs here than you can speak about. The hospital, bring a hospital in here. And not only that, bring more people in here to take -- get these treatments.

I've heard these people talk about how dangerous nuclear is. They don't realize that these microwaves, TVs that they're watching and use are just as dangerous. They put out probably just as much radiation as any common person out there working in the field.

I worked out there at Hanford for nine years. We go through a very special training before we go on a job. And the safety, if you have any doubt of going out there and you're working and don't feel comfortable about going in there, they put you on a different job. But the safety out there, from what I've seen in the 6, 7 years I was out there was outstanding.

I don't think, as a community of this Washington State, we should let FFTF die. And I'm asking DOE, as a farmer, to get this thing on the road because it's been too long sitting idle. You build another plant someplace else, you've got the same thing that, you're shipping all this waste in here, you're going to have to ship it out to the other place. You don't consider the tax dollar of the country when you do that.

This building here, the FFTF, is already here. All you have to do is get it running. And when I

was working with Claude Oliver a couple of years ago at Westinghouse, this plant could have been started within a month. I don't know what it is now, but I haven't been on the board working on this thing.

So as you know that the cost of the other buildings, transportation, safety, is detrimental to our county, our country, and our nation.

Not only that, we've taken a back seat already on nuclear waste. We need to take care of our nuclear waste. We don't need to be creating any more, but, you know, the hospitals, they create a lot of waste. You've got to take it some place. And all this chemo, it's got a lot of waste to it, so -- plus, in all, we got about half our ships supplying their power by nuclear power.

MR. LAWSON: One minute please.

MR. ZESIGER: We need someplace to take and get rid of this.

I was talking to a fellow this afternoon. He said that these smoke, salmon smoke, they're getting all this nuclear waste from the river. Well, I don't think so, because they live in the ocean five years, and they only come up here to spawn. And then they're hatched out, they're headed back to the ocean. The only place that you can pick up the nuclear radiation or mercury or

anything else is out there at the sea.

And also if you want to stop the war out there, which happened over in Iraq, just stop by China and buy the gas, because they're supplying it right now. Thank you all for coming out. Thank you for DOE. I'd like to see you start FFTF.

MR. LAWSON: Robert Beach. Mr. Beach is making his way. Mike Korenko that would be the following speaker and then Rick Gold.

MR. BEACH: Thank you. I'd like to thank the DOE for this opportunity. I will speak from the heart. I've been involved in nuclear programs since 1959. I've lived for months within 20 to 30 feet of an operating reactor. I'm still standing.

I've been every place from South Africa to Japan. I've seen nuclear programs. And every place I've seen them, they've increased the standard of living. I haven't seen a problem in the free world resulting from a nuclear plant. I don't understand some of the concerns. I don't understand that we can't address the GNEP program and leave out nuclear weapons and leave out perhaps radioisotopes.

I think we have two polarized view points. Here we're discussing should we recycle nuclear fuel and make the nuclear industry really vital? That's an

alternative that we foolishly threw away. The government threw away 20 to 30 years ago.

It's very heart warming to finally see the DOE take efforts to return the U.S. to prominence in the world in the field of nuclear energy. The DOE should be in the position of developing energy, not destroying it, not destroying the capability that national laboratory systems of the U.S. have been decimated by the actions of the DOE over the past years. We just simply cannot continue to do that if we intend to be a leading country in the world.

Any decision on the GNEP must include consideration of the supporting resources and the costs involved. The reuse of already existing facilities, whether it's out at FFTF or FMEF or Idaho or wherever, must be a very serious consideration.

I'd like to take the money from the war in Iraq and put it into an energy development program. Unfortunately, I'm not in power. Why does the DOE persist in destroying one facility and building an equivalent some place else? That just does not make very logical sense, so this is a major national program. It's extremely important to the county. We should look at it from that view point, not as local citizens from Washington or Oregon, even though we're concerned, we

should be concerned over the future of our country, entirely our country. We don't seem to think that way.

I find it inconceivable that DOE considers, at least says they consider this program for Hanford, and persists in destroying the facilities that exist here, even directing the contractor to proceed with utmost speed to bring the FFTF to a cold and dark condition.

Currently, we could destroy millions, tens of millions of dollars of parts simply because we have commuted contract deliverable. That seems inconceivable that DOE is even considering Hanford.

MR. LAWSON: One minute please. One minute, sir.

MR. BEACH: Thank you. One, this must be a national program. The decisions must be reached on a national basis. And the rest of the country should do whatever the national good is. The DOE should place a moratorium on additional deactivation at FFTF and FMEF.

Pending a decision on which direction they will go, we simply can't speak out of both sides of our mouths. The dollars we're talking about are in the tens and hundreds of millions of dollars. We really, really need leadership. The shipping between facilities must be considered in the proposals. We don't want one facility in South Carolina, one in Idaho and one in southern Utah.

The shipping costs would just be exorbitant. They should be co-located. I think that's it.

I'm very heart free, you know, I'm getting kind of old. But I've been around, and I've seen a lot of things. And we can take spent depleted uranium and make fuel out of it and burn it in this reactor. You don't have to throw it away. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker would be Mike Korenko and Mr. Gold. Is Mr. Gold here? And I propose that we take a short break. Is that all right, right after Mr. Gold speaks, two more speakers?

MR. KORENKO: My name is Mike Korenko. I was the vice president and general manager at Westinghouse Hanford that led the development of what we call the energy park concept, which is a precursor to GNEP. FFTF, FMEF and the development department in the nuclear are reported to me.

We are excited about the energy parks which gives a paths for meaningful decoupling of oil and did not generate greenhouse gases. What I want to do is to summarize for you some of the experiments that were completed at Hanford that are directly related to GNEP. They are not widely known in the field since at the time, DOE was trying to shut down FFTF, and the COEs were strongly encouraged not to communicate.

However, I did testify about these in Congress. So I'm just going to list some of these experiments because I think they are exciting, and it's about time they got some public airing.

Number one, on the processing side, we were able to go beyond the PUREX and TRUEX using other processes such as double freeze crystallization and some of the molecular scratching techniques.

The bottom line is, we can take the Hanford waste and hold it in our hands below the level Class 8. That was, of course, before our President Carter shut down all these programs.

Number two, we designed processes around the targets of FFTF that can produce to the tune of 2338 production. As you know, this is what was in the scene and the flight -- proposed flight to Mars.

In preparation for this mission, we actually already modified FMEF lower cells for production of this target, that was to be done specifically for this program. Even though DOE had to convert this mandated responsibilty to establish the source of isotopes in this country, and to buy our plutonium-238 from Russia and most of our medical isotopes from Canada.

Third parties are very important. We completed the breakthrough test called CURE, C-U-R-E,

Clean Use of Reactor Energy. Not only did it demonstrate the viabililty of producing a wide variety of isotopes, Colonel Richardson talked about, but what was the breakthrough is we were able to transmute a long-term technetium 99. As you know, technician 99 is one of the terrible long-life 10,000 year isotopes at Hanford waste.

What people don't know is, you can use a nuclear reactor to transude that to a nonradioactive material. That is a breakthrough. The first in the world was done at FFTF, not only actinite, but with the right paradigm and spectrum, you can get rid of the rest of it. You don't have to dilute it and put it in the ground. This was breakthrough technology and Bob Schenter was in the middle of it.

We took a different perspective on nuclear waste. It's not a waste. It's an asset. This is a mind set. If we concentrate and isolate all those isotopes instead of eluding them, it's going to need a generation of new businesses and new applications for medical and other industries.

We took technician 99, we armed it with a monoclonal antibody and we put it into cancer treatments. And what the monoclonal antibody does is it goes from the high growth areas and the technician yields it. Those are still in clinical trials. Just the technician 99, it

was a threat. It's actually an asset. From the standpoint of GNEP, we actually took it further. We analyzed all the physics, the path it flows and I told strongly recommend including an accelerator in your GNEP facilities, because with an accelerator, a fast and thermal reactor, there are some things we have discovered called project bumpy. You can create new isotopes. You can destroy isotopes, and you can have the medical treatment center for the storage of isotopes to recommended facilities. So I'd recommend you'd consider an accelerator option.

Advanced techniques developed in this program could directly apply to the treatment of Hanford waste. You'd be safer. In fact, that's part of DOE's policy to look for these. For some reason EM an ME don't seem to be communicating through some of the breakthroughs that are on the ME side.

So if we did this at Hanford, we could actually process some of the Hanford waste and make it safer by transmuting some of the long-life actinites, I mean, long-life radionuclides.

MR. LAWSON: One minute please.

MR. KORENKO: Even though the FFTF community fought to keep FFTF operating, when hind site mothballing was a great thing because now, its life has

been preserved.

I recommend dividing the program -- I'm obviously a strong advocate of this program, but the practical side of it, I recommend dividing it in two phases. It really is a lot to expect a community, a skeptical community, to take all the waste of the country.

If you broke into phase one, where you had a demonstration facility limited to recycling fuel generated at Energy Northwest, then generating isotopes and instruction of isotopes, get that under your belt and then go to phase two, which was allowed to rejoin importation of fuel from the reactor pools located in the Northwest. You have to crawl, walk, run.

And if you did phase it that way, you would actually be able to do the GNEP, but at the same time you do seem to risk the Hanford waste, because you would be destroying some of the isotopes, getting rid of the Energy Northwest fuel and the fuel cycle.

So with that, I just want to say that I strongly support this. We have the technology, the people, the will, and clearly the need for energy in the Northwest. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Rick Gold. And Mr. Gold, before you start, after a short

break, we'll come back and the following three speakers will be up: Richard Smith and Martin Bensky and Joel Williams.

MR. GOLD: Rick gold, for the record. I live in Eugene, and I come up here to speak, and for the people who don't live in your area. A lot of the nuclear waste of GNEP is talking about using here would have to travel to Hanford.

The problem with that is that they say a few people, just from the process of the traveling by truck or train or however, people would die along the roadway. And these are people, who like yourselves, just want to live their lives. And if that's not even considering that an accident might happen along the way.

No matter where DOE wants to truck the waste to be reprocessed, people will die. And I think that people who don't live here don't realize that other people are concerned about them. All over America, other people are concerned. I.

Mean from the start the DOE used to say that we would make energy too cheap to meter. Does anybody remember that? Now we've spent billions and billions and billions and billions and billions of dollars on nuclear and I still don't see energy too cheap to meter. People are paying astronomical rates for energy now, and it's

only going to go up.

I think that Hanford is a job's program. We don't want to see the jobs go away. I mean, they say they're going to clean up the mess that's already here, and they're paying to study it and paying to study it and paying to study it, and they haven't even cleaned up the mess they have here.

People, two years ago, overwhelmingly, 70 percent said, before we bring any more waste here, clean up the mess. But right now it's stalled in Court because they said, "No. We don't want to clean up the mess. We just want to keep funding studies." They said "We're going to build a vitrification plant. We're going to put it all in grass." Was supposed to be done by 2009 or 2007, something like that. Now, it's going to be 2019, if it ever happens. So people really don't trust. They don't believe the DOE.

The thing that we do see is that every time the DOE starts one of these sites, there's more waste. There's more toxic. There's more mess. And people around America are tired of it. We want to do something else. Renewable energy doesn't have these problems. And no matter what DOE says, there's always going to be this problem of waste for maybe hundreds and thousands of years, generations and generations. And people are fed

up. They're saying it's time to stop and do something else. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Now, as I announced, we'll take a short break. Again, some of you are leaving, I hope you're not, but if you are, thank you for attending. We'll take a five minute break and allow you to get a drink of water at least.

(Recess was taken).

MR. LAWSON: I'd like all of us back into the meeting please. We are in the back stretch, just to give you an idea of where we are. I believe we have about 18 speakers, and if each takes three minutes we'll finish up in one hour. It is now 20 minutes to ten. So that would be 10:30, quarter of eleven, if we can stick to three minutes. I give you that as a guide.

The next speaker. Let me make sure I've got this correct, because we've had a couple of changes. The next three speakers will be Martin Bensky, Joel Williams and Jerry Peltier. The next speaker right now would be Martin Bensky. An he's approaching the podium.

MR. BENSKY: Thank you. The Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP) has the potential to exploit nuclear energy to reduce our dependence on oil from unreliable sources, to provide a clean energy source that could impede the progress of the man-made component

of global warning, and to alleviate real and imagined problems of nuclear waste management.

The hypocrisy of those who cry loudest of our need to exploit clean energy sources, which offer minimal value and minimal capacity, and then cry loudest on our need to abandon nuclear energy is clearly evident, amusing, arrogant and annoying.

I would like to ask you this evening to do two things: One, recognize the enormous benefit that this bold, vital GNEP program could attain by exploiting the facilities, infrastructure and expertise available at the Hanford site, and two, ignore the hysterical ravings you hear from the uninformed/misinformed anti-nuclear activists from Oregon's and the west side of Washington.

It is unfortunate that the attitude of our governor and at least one of our senator is controlled by anti-nuclear, anti-Department of Energy, anti-Hanford, Seattle-based activist organizations, but I believe that a simple declaration that Hanford cleanup will not be compensated by participation in GNEP. And in fact would be enhanced by it, would neutralize their attempt to forward their rid-the-world-of-anything-nuclear. Political consideration should not and need not be a significant factor in selecting sites best suited to implement major GNEP functions.

You are undoubtedly aware of the capabilities and resources available at this site, and you understand waste management technology and risks far better than the people who will spew Chernobyl scenarios and other nonsense at you at this and similar meetings at other sites.

I would ask you to separate the sense from the nonsense and focus on what the GNEP program really needs and what each site can really provide. In that context I believe Hanford will fare very well. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Next speaker is Joel Williams and then Jerry Peltier and Tom Burke.

MR. WILLIAMS: Hello. My name is Joel Williams and I worked on the Hanford facilities for 31 years as a mechanical engineer and as an environmental engineer. You've already heard all the points I'm going to say about three or four dozen times, but I thought I'd review them anyway. I really only have three points I want to talk about.

One is -- My three points, and the fist one I'd like to talk about is the research and educational facilities here at Hanford. That includes PNNL, WSU and the University of Washington, which does have a nuclear program, which they've scaled down considerably. But

they would like to build back up again, which I've met several times with the Seattle BI section.

The second part I want to talk about is the work force here. We have so many outstanding engineers, scientists, and work forces in general, like our labor forces, our mechanical people, and operations, and that type of thing. They have done outstanding work.

I started out at Hanford as an operations person, so I understand what they're going through. And I worked my way up through as engineer essentially.

And my last thing is the cost. I think it would be a waste not to use the FFTF since it's already built, it's already there. And it's just going to take just major -- probably minor modifications or major modification, either way, but it's still cheaper than any other facility anywhere in the United States. And the report, of course, they have now they thought that DOE personnel involved in FFTF are outstanding and know what they need to do to get this unit back online.

And finally, I just want to say that we should use GNEP here at Hanford, because at Hanford, we know what it's all about. We know what nuclear is and we know how to handle it. I know that people are scared of nuclear waste and such, but it can be handled. And it can be controlled. We have our problems and such. We

have handled it, and we are going to handle it in the future. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Jerry Peltier and Tom Burke and Jana Thrift.

MR. PELTIER: Good evening. I'm Jerry Peltier. I'm a retired Hanford worker. 24 years an elected official in the Tri-Cities area, and I've spent 20 of those years up and down the hallways of DOE headquarters and Congress lobbying for the issues that come before us. And as usual, we are not here with any new issues tonight. I'm certainly not going to spend my whole speech talking about the capabilities of Hanford. I think they've been covered adequately tonight by people that are far more qualified than I am.

My interests lie in the actual scoping of the EIS. I'd like to, for the first time, see something that comes out of DOE be a success. We have an opportunity here. The world is embracing what we're talking about, GNEP, tonight. It's going to happen ladies and gentlemen, whether we get onboard or not.

It's a shame than the technology that we're talking about tonight originated in the United States and rest of the world is now benefitting from that technology and this is a chance for us to get back in to the development of nuclear technology. And I use it not

bombs, but technology. We have not even scratched the surface of the capabilities of the technology.

But like any technology, whether you're driving a car, making paper, building airplanes or whatever in the sate, it's a waste of a byproduct that comes off of the processing of any type of industry. We have a waste product here. That waste product has not been managed very well over the lifetime of a Hanford reservation and the nuclear products that are here.

We are now making an attempt to do what we can to clean up the waste that we have, and I do think the scope of the PEIS have got to address the life cycle of the plans that they're proposing.

If it's going to generate waste, what kind of waste and where is that waste going to go, can it be reprocessed for example the waste be reprocessed in our vitrification plant that we're building. Is there a combination or a possible harmony for the future there?

The people of Washington we talked about 297 and said they are not in favor of bringing more waste to Hanford. If we're going to do that, the EIS is going to say how we're going to do it, when we're going to do with it. Is it going to be processed here and then go to Yucca Mountain, or what are we really going to do to revitalize?

Another thing that hasn't been talked about, we've talked about spent nuclear -- spent fuel from commercial reactors, which the DOE has had an obligation to take care of for 30 years, and they're finally waking up to that point.

What we need to do is talk about -- what about if transuranic waste that we already have at Hanford, and some of the waste at Hanford, is there anything in this program that's going to benefit the reduction of what we already have onsite. I think that's important to know.

Believe me coming from the nuclear background that I come from, this program is going to be a benefit because it is the first time that you've seen science and technology be able to step in and reduce the waste envelope in a nuclear industry. And we have to do something about it.

And this is an opportunity to do something, and we just absolutely cannot afford not to take the steps forward necessary to improve this technology and reduce the waste of nuclear power and the, EIS has got to explain that in detail, otherwise you're never going to sell it to the public of this state and not -- This community, you have a lot of knowledge, but the state, you don't. So you're going to sell it to EIS scoping has

got to include these formulas. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Next speaker is Tome Burke and Jana Thrift and Vicky Carwein.

MR. BURKE: Thank you. My name is Tom Burke from the great little town of Prosser, so go Mustangs. I did prepare some comments for this meeting tonight, and I will submit them in writing, but basically everything that I was going to cover has already been covered several times, and it is getting pretty late, so I'll just quickly reiterate five key points.

Point number one is that current and future generations both in the United States and around the world really need nuclear energy. There really is no other choice.

Number two, fuel recycling and waste burn, which is what GNEP is all about are key to advancing nuclear energy.

Number three, I believe a test reactor is needed to develop the fuel to put in with this new reactor design. We cannot jump into building a bid new reactor with an unproven fuel design.

Number four, testing fuel is exactly what FFTF was built for. That was its mission. It proved that it could do that mission extremely well.

Number five, recovery of the FFTF, there's no

question about it, it's a huge job. But it can be done. And it can be done at a fraction of the cost of building a new reactor. They might ask, how do I know that. The reason I know that is because I've been directly responsible for much of the damage that we've done to that facility.

It's now time to stop. It's time to reverse what we've done and get FFTF restarted. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Lana Thrift to be followed by Vicky Carwein and Pete Gier.

MS. THRIFT: My name is Jana Thrift. And I'm a mother of six children. I lived in Alaska for about 17 years. When I moved here, I was horrified about the acceptance of pollution. Where I have lived, there was none. And it was kind of a concept in my mind "this is bad." But here, people live in a neighborhood, where I moved, that said, you know, the ground water is contaminated here, but nobody really cares. And so this is really scary to me.

And this is actually kind of a new subject to me, but I'm I just earned degrees in alternative because of my alternative interests in automotive and diesel technology hoping to change our modes of transportation because we're polluting our planet in a big way.

And there are other possibilities. There are

other choices that we can make, like nuclear energy is not the only choice. I'm a part of GREEN, the Grass Roots Energy Education Network. And we've created GREEN because we feel that our grass roots is worth educating people about renewable energies needed since our government, it seems to -- not to sincerely promote many other viable and safer forms of energy.

Truth is that nuclear projects are hazardous, you know, like it is proven that it causes cancer and deforms children. I really liked the speaker's reference to never give up, because since the '60s and before that, people like me have been saying no more nukes. We don't need to create this substance because there are other choices.

A lot of people here seem to want to sell Hanford as the new GNEP site, a very biased article in the Tri-City Herald spent half a page talking about money, and jobs and money and industrial competitiveness. And is money really the bottom line here, or is it about how safe is our community? How safe is the future for your children and our planet?

We have technologies beyond belief and what resources the U.S. has, we could be real leaders towards creating safe sustainable energy. How many homes could be filled with solar power with money proposed for

spending on building just one of these reactors?

It's been suggested that a recycling center would get rid of nuclear waste, but these recycled materials could be used for weapons of war. Please say no to war, no to killing, and no to the fallacy of safe hazardous material.

People in Washington voted for Hanford to be cleaned up before more nuclear waste is brought here. Here, I have heard testimony about desires for cleanup that's part of this plan. But some on reading about court procedures to refuse the desires of the people's vote.

What happened to "by the people, for the people"? We are destroying the purpose of the constitution by ignoring the people's vote, the very basis of our legislative process.

GNEP is a global proposal. Is our best hope for this planet really to transport hazardous waste materials across our roads and rivers? What are the odds of an accident? Do we really believe that the cure for cancer best contained by nuclear energy needs through the very materials that cause the disease? Is this really the best answer all of our brilliant minds can come up with, you know, really?

In regard to the whole world doing it, I want

to call my own mother. She used to say to me, "if everyone jumped off a bridge, would I? Would I do that too?"

The U.S. should be a leader in solutions that are safe. How do you make nuclear waste safe, with sealed containers going down our rivers? I don't give my children unsafe things to play with even in sealed containers, because chances are there will eventually be an accident.

Pointing out all the other hazardous materials we've created, doesn't convince me of anything except that we have many problems to address.

MR. LAWSON: One minute please.

MS. THRIFT: When I speak to my children about playing with fire, I say "Don't play with fire," and not that I will make anything available if the house starts to burn down.

A research reactor implies that was are experimenting with hazardous nuclear waste to see if nuclear reactors are improving the hazard of nuclear power is improving. Are we really suggesting to reduce risk by testing with nuclear reactors? Please recognize this oxymoron. Have we learned nothing from nuclear disasters suffered in the past?

There are so many renewable energy

possibilities. First, we spend our resources promoting conservation. We are a country that's using up our planet's resources by blatant disregard of the fact that we use more than we need. We don't need more energy, we need to use energy we have in a productive way and with realistic goals to what we really need.

Many statement have been made about nuclear energy's use worldwide, but it needs to also be pointed out that many other countries are supporting much safer renewable energy production, way more than the United States.

Solar energy in Germany, which is actually a lot less of it is available. They've got crazy amount of solar power going in over there. The amount of money that we're spending on nuclear energy could be spent on renewable energies.

MR. LAWSON: I have to ask you to finish up if you would please.

MS. THRIFT: People here seem to be defensive as to what harm nuclear hazardous materials can do. It seems to me that if you don't die from cancers undoubtedly caused by your environment, it's okay. If it takes 20 years to see its effect, there must be not be any.

Finally, I want to ask our government to

hold these meetings in places where the results don't seem rigged. I hear your community representatives call this area a nuclear friendly environment. To have their testimony, communities throughout our country should be heard. We will all be affected by this choice.

I dare the DOE to promote these meetings, to find out what all the U.S. citizens really think. The bottom line here is not about money, it's about safety in our community. It's about the future of our planet and human life as we know it.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Vicky Carwein followed by Pete Gier or Gier and then Charles Holden.

MS. CARWEIN: I wish to speak from a higher education perspective as chancellor of Washington State University, Tri-Cities, one of four campuses of Washington State University, a major research wand land grant institution.

I'd like to just briefly identify current key assets that are pertinent to this partnership. A local four year research institution that is directly across the street from a national laboratory, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. There is a currently the availability of degree programs, from a Bachelor's Degree through the HD programs and post docs.

WSU currently has expertise in power systems and engineering and security of the power network. And now, technology and fuel cell research, and environmental and soil chemistry and microbiology.

In addition, Washington State University has one of the largest actinite chemistry departments in this part of the country and when combined with the complimentary capabilities of PNNL, together they are a major force in the entire country in radiochemistry.

In addition, we are currently building a bio-product signs of an engineering laboratory. Our new facility, $50 million of the investment of state, federal and university investments in a 50/50 partnership with PNNL to do research, provide educational programs and disseminate information relative to bio-products, energy and fuels.

Regarding the PEIS, I would like to see a couple of things. Assess what jobs are going to be needed, and what new educational programs are required to educate the work force. And consider a plan to integrate higher education into the partnership as the provider of the work force, in research and development, and add the length to the Department in transfer of knowledge both nationally and internationally.

We currently have existing in the Tri-Cities

educational and the technical infrastructure and capabilities that can easily be expanded to meet the need for education. It makes sense to build these facilities in places where higher education resources already exist, especially research one university capabilities to actively support the R & D work and supply the needed work force.

Preference should be given to these locations. I just happen to know of such an institution that is locoed here in the Tri-Cities. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker us Pete Gier. Is Mr. Gier here? Okay. Charles Holden to be followed by Robert Cook and Fran Forgette.

MR. HOLDEN: Good evening. I'm Charles Holden. I'm from San Francisco. I'm here representing my firm called Thurento. I wish in summation to bring up a couple of point that haven't been mentioned by our speakers tonight.

At this time in history, we have computational excellence. We have super computers. We have the academic community and we have Pacific Northwest Laboratory, part of this community is integrated into the Department of Energy's information resources.

The informational power of this science and these skilled computationalists is enormous and hasn't

yet really been perceived by the general public, the general scientific community, or those who claim that somehow we should be afraid of the advancement of the art and science of nuclear power and of the transmutation of matter.

The nuclear waste issue is a different one than the problem confronted by earlier generations. Now, with computational power, we were have the ability to subtract neutrons from separated matter or the ability to add neutrons.

This ability gives us the great benefit of shortening the time that the material is unstable. This means the nuclear waste footprint can be made miniscule. And I wish to advance these concepts.

I wish to have the Department of Energy alert to this and it should be part of our scoping as the use of informational power available to us to resolve many of these international problems and political problems generated from ignorance.

Further, on the issue of nonproliferation, there's no doubt that the transuranics can be burned out. We need the FFTF test fuels to accomplish this result. Once the transuranics are burned out, the plutonium problem is somewhat managed, much safer than it is today.

Furthermore, in addition of products can be

managed as I have suggested by the use of these transmutational techniques, not only the reactors, special reactors, but also extremely powerful beams of protons and gamma radiation.

These are the tools of the instruments to advance the art and to make the world somewhat safer than it is today to recede cause the problems of global warming to somewhat receive, take a few wedges out of our great carbon overload that we have, but most importantly, I think, to bring more of a chance for political international political stability with less reliance upon oil and coal.

So those are my remarks, and I hope the Department chooses Hanford. The assets are here. The cadre of skilled hands are here, men and women, and of coursed the science professionals. Gray matter absolutely necessary to achieve these goals. The government should use its assets and it should use them wisely, because most important thought I conclude with is this: The risk of completion of the mission is lowest at Hanford because the physical assets are here and skilled cadre is here and the computational power is here.

So I would recommend to the Department in all particulars that Hanford be made part of GNEP, as this concerns the national community and the international

community markedly well. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Robert Cook and then Fran Forgette and then Don Segna.

MR. COOK: I'm Robert Cool. I live in Richland, and a resident of Alaska actually. I've been in the nuclear power program fore 45 years about. One -- I'd like to address the scope technically too. It's not clear to me the Fast Flux, the sodium reactors are necessary to recycle fuel.

There have been a number of programs in this country, which looked at mixed oxide fuel. And when I was with the Naval Reactors program, we developed and ran a fast -- a light water breed reactor with a planned Uranium cycle, Uranium 233 cycle. The reason that didn't catch on was the processing of the fuel new was problematic because the uranium has a slight radioactive tinge to it, the uranium-233, so that was arguments of AEC at that time not to do that program, even know we produced more fissile material than 233 from sodium was no proliferation of plutonium in that cycle, basically, or uranium-235. So that cycle that fuel cycle ought to be looked at in the long -- in the grand scheme of the things with mixed oxide fuel being generated from the reprocessing.

The other aspect, the DOE certainly ought to look at alternatives -- I believe the Koreans had developed a fuel process that actually reprocessed fuel and cycled and cycled and cycled it. And that cycling ought to be one of the options that is looked at in the scope of whatever reactor you come up with.

In the way of waste management, it was pointed out by the Deputy Secretary, that there is no gaseous emissions from the reactor plants with the inference that the reprocessing wouldn't have any gaseous emissions either.

I can say that the vitrification plant out here discharges tall the carbon 14, which is a long-lived isotope to the atmosphere using it a dilution mechanism for carbon 14. So any reprocessing ought to look at taking care of carbon 14 as well as all the other isotopes, not just Iodine-120 and Technician 99, but all the other isotopes like Selenium and Cesium-135 and all the other long lived isotopes. There's been oodles and oodles of studies done that looked at the long-lived isotopes from spent fuel. And they certainly ought to be considered and all the isotopes addressed in whatever study there is for reprocessing.

Again, this life cycle concept ought to be addressed thoroughly, and there should be a credible and

acceptable disposal scheme for whatever's left over. Keep in mind that that whole issue of disposal of nuclear waste was what stopped the nucleare industry in the '70s here. It wasn't a viable solution for the disposable, and I'm not sure that there is a viable solution yet, but nevertheless, that issue should be addressed in the EIS.

The other questions that I had was whether or not the scope would entail a commercial facility that would be used worldwide or whatever. I would recommend that any scoping include consideration of commercial facilities for all these potential facilities that are going to be useful in the long-term, and that they all address the proliferation issue of Plutonium and whatever. I mean, that was the reason why we didn't go with a fast breeder reactor in the '70s, was because of proliferation of Plutonium.

So look at all the schemes to reduce that problem, and whether or not this system really does it, the uranium-235, 233 the cycle for U-233 may not have the significant problems with the other bomb type isotopes and maybe a better solution in the long-term.

MR. LAWSON: One minute please.

MR. COOK: I think those are the -- Oh, one last issue is that the in light of the idea of looking at making this commercial, you ought to look at

getting NRC involved with the licensing of the facility and assure that such a facility will cut the mustard in the long run if it were to become a commercial entity.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Now, just before they leave, I want to thank our signers for a fantastic job you did. I hope you noticed how accurate they were.

Our next speaker if Fran Forgette or Forgette. No? Don Segna? Okay. Mr. Segna, Floyd Hodges?

MR. SEGNA: I'm Don Segna. I'm speaking for myself and not a company that I started. But I've only got two items here. And what got me interested in this thing is that I didn't know who GNEP was. So I go asking people around, what is GNEP, General Nuclear Energy Power, something like that? No. That's Global. I said "Global? You mean there are other countries that actually want to work with United States on a nuclear project?" And I just was floored that that was the case.

And the third thing I haven't heard tonight -- I know I got a lot of giants backing of me, but what concerns me is all this weapons isotopes that's around every reactor around this country. And we're concerned about Hanford only? We've got to get that recycled and cleaned up. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Floyd Hodges is not here I take it? Okay. Then Jean Dolling to be followed by Donna Kirk. Is Ms. Kirk here. Okay. You'll be the next speaker.

MS. DOLLING: I'd like to thank everybody that's held on and been faithful to this evening's program. I would like to concede first of all, that we do still live in a predator's world. And we got here because there was no way we could sit idly by and let some other nation develop nuclear energy to be used as a weapon against us. So that's how we got here.

And this isn't, you know, some mess that's been tracked in and we've got to, you know, just move out of it. We've got to do something to clean it up. And it just makes logical sense to me to revisit all this nuclear waste and burn it up if we can, to where it's no longer damaging. But the original nuclear reactor out there, 93 million miles away is also something that we need to look at utilizing in the future.

You know, we've come along way from mud and shit in Main Street with the horses, and a lot of people didn't want too see that go away. And the first thing was the one-cylinder engine. Now, you have to go to old iron shows to see those run. And I think that, you know, we're at a crossroad right now, where we need to look at

going another direction and to have balance is the thing, you know. You look at a balance scale, and where do you have the best place to be is right at the fulcrum. You don't want to be on one end or the other.

So I don't think that we ought to look at giving up nuclear totally. And I don't know what, five, seven years ago, whey they started talking about dismantling the FFTF, I thought "well, that makes sense, you know, because typically, that's what the government does to us."

You know, you get a bunch of politicians in there that need to be changed, like, you know, diapers. And what they should do, they don't do, and what they shouldn't do, is what they do do. And that's why the FFTF problem is, you know, is something that we're looking at starting up now.

If we had kept it going, we wouldn't be spending millions more, the way we are. So it's no wonder people were fighting out there about nuclear, and we do have a problem. We can't contain it, but I think they understood that when they, you know, back in the '20s and '30s. And hopefully, somewhere in the future the technology would come that we could burn it up like we say sometime this, you know, billions of years from now may become a black hole because there's no more

energy left there.

But I don't like the idea of nuclear, you know, up close in our face can get you killed. So I think we ought to start looking at harnessing some nuclear out there from the sky too. Thank you everyone.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Donna Kirk to be followed by Curtis Hall, I believe so and Jim Paglieri.

MS. KIRK: Pretty much everybody has said everything that I would say. They said it a lot better than I could have. Especially Alan Waltar. He's a great mind. And he's just one of many great minds that have a deep concise understanding of the potential here at Hanford.

And this isn't going to just impact Tri-Cities or the State another Washington or Eugene, this is going to make a difference about whether the United States is going to be competitive in our world.

Now, we can either get on this bus, and that means using the FFTF now and not waiting until we build another reactor, using it for all this research and development that needs to be done. Use it. Do it now. Get it done as quickly as possible. Continue, get going. Get the other reactor built, all these other things you need to do, but we've got to use the FFTF, because if we

miss this bus, we better all start learning French and Chinese.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. And our next speaker is Jim Paglieri. You could pronounce the "G" or not depending on who you are.

MR. PAGLIERI: That's right.

MR. LAWSON: You'll tell us what it is.

MR. PAGLIERI: I'm Jim Pagliere. As a -- I'll try and cut my comments short and submit written comments.

As a retired FFTF nuclear engineer, I have several comments. The three parts of the domestic GNEP proposal and in two of the international parts of the proposal, should be aggressively pursued. Why? Some reasons are GNEP was raising hell extend our nuclear fuel supply and contribute it to energy independence.

Reduce the amount of long-lived radioactive waste while safely producing electricity, reduce nuclear proliferation concerns and it's the only large and mature technology capable of meeting the anticipated growth and energy needs without producing greenhouse gases and offers a source of medical isotopes.

The existing facilities at Hanford, FFTF, FMEF, MASF and the sodium storage facility or SSF, should be seriously considered as they appear to be a good fit

and they have already been paid for by the tax payers.

Also the existing facilities at Hanford offer some unique capabilities, for example, the currently operational IEM cell at FFTF, one of the tallest hot cells in the world. Clean up of Hanford waste can progress simultaneously along with GNEP.

Also Hanford offers an existing and extensive infrastructure and an experienced technically knowledgeable work force.

And in summary, the Unites States should vigorously proceed with both the both the domestic and international initiatives of GNEP. And 400 Area facilities at Hanford should be seriously considered.

History will likely judge us very unfavorably if we just squander our energy resources by burying our only partially used nuclear fuel, and judge us, a nation of great vision if seize the opportunity and proceed with GNEP. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: I have come to the end of my list. Let me just say a couple of final comments here for the few of you have still remained. First of all, than you very much your indulgence and staying around. We heard a lot of fine comments on both sides. And I appreciate the time that people have taken, not only to come to the meeting, but to prepare their comments.

This then, will conclude this session of the scoping meeting on the GNEP PEIS. Thank you for your participation and comments. Also please note that you may continue to submit comments on the scope of the PEIs until comment period closes on April 4th.

Check your packet for explicit information regarding how and where to submit these comments. I'd like to thank Mr. Black and Mr. Furstenau for their indulgence in being here tonight and also our court reporter, and the sign people they've done a fantastic job and we appreciate that.

And also thank you for your participation. This meeting is now adjourned. Drive safely.

(10:15 p.m.)

STATE OF WASHINGTON.)
) ss.
County of Benton)

I, Monica T. Breeden, do hereby certify that at the time and place heretofore mentioned in the caption of the foregoing matter, I was a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public for Washington; that at said time and place I reported in stenotype all testimony adduced and proceedings had in the foregoing matter; that thereafter my notes were reduced to typewriting and that the foregoing transcript consisting of 134 typewritten pages is a true and correct transcript of all such testimony adduced and proceedings had and the whole thereof.

Witness my hand at Richland, Washington, on this _____ day of _____ 2007.

_____
Monica T. Breeden
CCR NO. 2775
Certified Court Reporter
Notary Public of Washington
My commission expires: 3-7-10